

JPRS-TAC-85-043

23 October 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

23 October 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Moscow: ASAT Test Shows U.S. Intentions for Geneva Talks (Moscow World Service, 21 Sep 85).....	1
TASS Notes U.S. Institute Report on History of U.S. ASAT Policy (Moscow TASS, 1 Sep 85).....	3
Soviet Paper Views Canadian Public Opinion on SDI (Yuriy Lobov, Nikolay Pastukhov; Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 7 Jul 85).....	4
Italian CP's Pajetta on SDI (Milan L'UNITA, 22 Sep 85).....	8

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: Reagan, Shevardnadze Discuss Geneva Talks (Various sources, 27, 28 Sep 85).....	9
Television Announcement	9
Talks 'Important, Useful'	10
TASS Correction	10
Lomeyko Press Conference Remarks	10
Meeting With Shultz	11
Soviet Army Paper Rebuts Reagan Statements on Talks (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 26 Sep 85).....	12
Moscow TV: 'Still Opportunities' Despite U.S. Actions (Boris Kalyagin; Moscow Television Service, 29 Sep 85).....	14
Moscow Reviews First Two Rounds of Geneva Talks (Vladimir Tsvetov; Moscow Domestic Service, 31 Aug 85).....	16

USSR Reports on Third Round Meetings (Moscow TASS, various dates; AFP, 1 Oct 85).....	18
Strategic Arms Group 25 Sep	18
Medium-Range Group 26 Sep	18
Plenary Meeting 30 Sep	18
Space Weapons Group 30 Sep	18
Plenary Meeting 1 Oct	19
Karpov Discusses New Proposals	19
Soviet Weekly on Prospects for Geneva Talks, CDE, MBFR (Moscow NEW TIMES, No 36, Sep 85).....	20
SALT/START ISSUES	
TASS: U.S. Strategic Arms Development Program Grows (Moscow TASS International Service, 29 Sep 85).....	24
Briefs TASS on Minuteman-3 Test	25
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
TASS Cites Belgian Premier: Deployment Decision 'Imposed' by U.S. (Moscow TASS, 21 Sep 85).....	26
Dutch Constitutional Arguments Against INF Rejected (S. W. Couwenberg; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 21 Sep 85)..	27
CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE	
Soviet Gen Tatarov Denounces NATO Exercises (Moscow TASS, 30 Sep 85).....	30
Soviet Counterproposal on Mutual Notification (Paris AFP, 4 Oct 85).....	31
CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT	
USSR's Israelyan Comments on Results of Summer Session (Moscow TASS, 30 Aug 85).....	32
NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS	
Icelandic Proposal on Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone (Reykjavik THJODVILJINN, 6 Sep 85).....	33
TASS: FRG, GDR Parties To Begin Talks on C. European Zone (Moscow TASS, 26 Sep 85).....	35

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR: 'Anti-Soviet Blinders' Prevent Weapons Test Ban (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 28 Sep 85).....	36
---	----

GENERAL

USSR: Comments on Gorbachev Arms Proposals on Visit to France (Various sources, various dates).....	38
Proposals Summarized	38
Addressed to Europe, World, by Stanislav Kondrashov	40
U.S. Should 'Think Over' Proposals, by Vladimir Chernyshev	42
Washington in 'Confusion', by Boris Kalyagin	44
U.S., NATO Consultations	45
IZVESTIYA Editorial	46
PRAVDA Weekly Review	48
McFarlane Remarks Hit	50
TASS on Foreign Media Reaction to Gorbachev French TV Interview (Moscow PRAVDA, 3 Oct 85).....	52
USSR's Zagladin Critiques French Arms Policies (Vadim Zagladin; Paris Le MONDE, 3 Oct 85).....	54
Moscow Hits U.S. Stand on Soviet Initiatives (Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 13 Sep 85).....	56
TASS Hits Conservative Senators' Letter on Arms Control (Moscow TASS, 9 Oct 85).....	60
Moscow Weekly Roundtable on New Soviet Proposals (Moscow Domestic Service, 6 Oct 85).....	62
Soviet Arms Proposals	62
World Reaction	65
Necessity for Talks	65
Chemical Weapons	66
European Participation	66
Soviet-French Discussions	67
Moscow Weekly Talk Show: New Proposals, INF (Moscow Domestic Service, 4 Oct 85).....	68
Gorbachev Proposals in France	68
Netherlands Protests in INF	71
Gorbachev Greets Italian Peace Marchers (Moscow PRAVDA, 7 Oct 85).....	73

TASS Cites PRAVDA on UN Session, Notes Arms Race on Agenda (Moscow TASS, 28 Sep 85).....	74
Soviets Reaffirm Support for UN Nonuse of Force Treaty (Moscow TASS, 8 Oct 85).....	75
USSR's Lomeyko on CSCE, Arms Issues (V. Lomeyko; Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN, No 9, Sep 85)....	77
IZVESTIYA: Soviet, FRG Citizens Discuss European Security (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 2 Oct 85).....	83
PRAVDA Criticizes PRC Foreign Minister on Arms Speech (Moscow PRAVDA, 2 Oct 85).....	85

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW: ASAT TEST SHOWS U.S. INTENTIONS FOR GENEVA TALKS

LD211736 Moscow World Service in English 1431 GMT 21 Sep 85

[Text] On 13 September the Pentagon tested on antisatellite system ASAT. Viktor Sivakov supplies the details.

The testing confirmed that Washington views outer space as a potential theater of operations. It can lead to the deployment of a new class of very dangerous weapons, strike space weapons, moreover, because the recent experiment was not the last one. This year the Pentagon plans to test the ASAT system on low-orbit targets two more times. Then the testing stage will lead to the actual deployment of an antisatellite system. That is why it is necessary to explain its place in Washington's general strategy.

Operating from U.S. territory, ASAT systems can keep at gunpoint approximately a quarter of terrestrial orbits. What about the rest? Washington is discussing various versions of ASAT system deployment outside U.S. territory. Several exact addresses have been named. The ones in Asia are U.S. bases in Diego Garcia, the Philippines, Japan and islands in the Pacific -- in particular on Kwajalein atoll and Johnston Island. The United States shows special interest in launching-pads for space systems in the Indian Ocean. The lowest part of the orbits of most satellites goes above the region. There, satellites are most vulnerable for attacks; that's why the Pentagon is taking active steps to build new military bases in the Indian Ocean. U.S. warships operating in the Indian and Pacific oceans are being equipped with ASAT systems. The U.S. military network in Asia is being actively involved in the "star wars" program.

News analysts say that the ASAT system and the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative are akin in their technical characteristics. The American AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY says technology required by ASAT and the Strategic Defense Initiative is clearly similar. In other words, the Pentagon will use the current tests for building antimissile orbital stations. Such programs are not prompted by defense interests of the United States, as Washington claims; they show the intentions of the American command to deliver the first nuclear strike and guarantee the United States of America from retribution.

American Defense Under Secretary Ikle has said the use of antisatellite systems as an element of a first strike for destroying all or many key enemy satellites will considerably complicate a retaliatory strike. Thus both Pentagon's technical preparations and the first nuclear strike doctrine approved in the United States reveal the aggressive intentions of Washington. The administration is again obsessed with the adven-

turist quest of an absolute weapon which would give the United States decisive superiority in strategic armaments and let it impose its will on others.

It is indicative that the ASAT system is tested at a time when Soviet-American talks are held in Geneva. The Soviet side favors the prevention of the militarization of space. We feel that the beginning of an absolutely new stage of the arms race, the militarization of space, must be prevented. Moscow is calling for serious agreements on strategic armaments and space issues with the United States. The Soviet-American summit meeting is approaching, the Soviet Union is going to the meeting with a desire to do its utmost for disarmament because this is the only road to peace.

CSO: 5200/1038

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS NOTES U.S. INSTITUTE REPORT ON HISTORY OF U.S. ASAT POLICY

LD011529 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 1 Sep 85

[Text] New York, 1 Sep (TASS)--The Reagan administration's decision to conduct combat testing of anti-satellite weapons is evidence of its flagrant disregard for the process of arms control and true national security interests of the USA. This is pointed out in a report issued here by the Institute for Peace and Security Studies.

The authors of the report expose the false arguments put forward by the White House in an attempt at justifying the continuation of anti-satellite weapons testing. They stress that for decades the United States has implemented programmes based on the concept of the use of anti-satellite systems. The first testing of such a system code-named "Bold Orion" was conducted in the USA way back in 1959. An interceptor satellite was designed in the USA in the late 1950's within the framework of the "Saint" project.

From 1963 to 1967 the testing of another anti-satellite weapons system with the use of a Nike-Zeus missile was conducted. Over a period of eleven years, from 1964 to 1975 the USA had among its arms anti-satellite complexes deployed on Kwajalein and Johnston Islands in the Pacific. In the latter half of the 1970's work was started to develop the ASAT system.

The Soviet Union, the report says, has repeatedly tabled proposals at the UN and proposed the USA several times to conclude a bilateral agreement on a ban of anti-satellite weapons. As far as the USA is concerned, the report points out, it has rejected all the Soviet proposals in that field. The only obstacle preventing the conclusion of such an agreement is the stand of the USA which is trying to force on the Soviet Union an arms race in outer space through the implementation of the "Star Wars" programme.

Washington, 1 Sep (TASS)--According to a report of the newspaper WASHINGTON POST, the initiative to conduct combat testing of an anti-satellite system came from the White House. This decision, the newspaper stresses, as official and unofficial representatives say, is designed to demonstrate to the Soviet Union and Congress the administration's decision to carry on work to develop such a weapon.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET PAPER VIEWS CANADIAN PUBLIC OPINION ON SDI

Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 7 Jul 85 p 3

[Article by Yuriy Lobov and Nikolay Pastukhov, special correspondents for SELSKAYA ZHIZN, Ottawa--Moscow: "'Star Wars' Networks," under the rubric "From a Canadian Notebook"]

[Text] We did not have a single meeting with Canadians in the course of which, directly or indirectly, the topic of Reagan's "star wars" was not discussed. As far as Canada is concerned as a whole, this topic has taken on the character of sharp intrapolitical discussion. Before reporting on it, we should acquaint the reader with the prehistory of military relations between the two North American countries.

In 1958 an agreement was signed between the USA and Canada regarding the creation of an American-Canadian command for the anti-aircraft defense of North America. Under pressure from Washington it was extended in 1981, "edited" accordingly and renamed the United Command for Aerospace Defense of North America (NORAD). The time for a new extension of the agreement is approaching in March of next year. Perhaps it would have passed unnoticed, as it did before, if the Canadian people had not found out that the USA is doing its very best to link their country with Reagan's "star wars" program. The majority of Canadians understand the catastrophic consequences this may bring.

The public is suspicious, especially in connection with the fact that a considerable portion of the taxes paid by Canadians, once in the budget, is sent without any particular hesitation to be used for military purposes. Since the beginning of the 80s, military spending in Canada has begun to grow at an especially rapid rate. During the last four years it suddenly jumped by 73 percent. The announcement by the Canadian government that in the near future this budget line would increase annually by no less than 6 percent was perceived with satisfaction by Washington.

As far as NORAD is concerned, the opposition parties have demanded that the government declassify negotiations with the USA on military matters and bring the topic of whether or not to continue the period of active agreement to legislators for discussion. Well-informed deputies of parliament think that the changes which have come about are evidence that almost five years

ago the Pentagon was already hatching concrete plans for militarizing space and linking Canada to this dangerous undertaking.

The disclosure led to an explosion of Canadian public opinion and an activation of the peace movement. Now it would already be rather difficult to bypass the Canadian parliament in extending the agreement. In Washington the alarm was sounded. President Ronald Reagan immediately flew to Canada, where he conducted secret negotiations with Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. This happened at the end of March. The essence of the negotiations again leaked out to the Canadian and American press. According to reports, Reagan insisted on further American-Canadian military collaboration and the modernization of NORAD. Meanwhile Pentagon Chief Weinberger, in an appearance on Canadian television, announced the possibility that American rocket installations, as well as systems components for waging "star wars," might be stationed in Canada "under certain circumstances."

This communication roused all of Canada. "Public alarm," wrote the influential TORONTO STAR newspaper, "is growing to the extent that the U.S. Government continues to press through its extremely controversial 'star wars' program." The newspaper GLOBE AND MAIL wrote that public anxiety over the NORAD intrigues "is connected primarily with the fact that in the future they could become a part of the 'star wars' program."

We visited the editor of this nationwide newspaper, and were received with good will. A frank, professional conversation took place--the kind appropriate for journalists among themselves. Naturally we held differing views on a number of topics. However we agreed on one thing: the need to write honestly and openly, and, most importantly, to do everything in our power to avoid war. The chief editor of GLOBE AND MAIL, Norman Webster, suggested we look through the latest issues of the paper. This, he added, would give us the opportunity to learn that the GLOBE AND MAIL expresses its own opinions on the burning issues of the day--which do not always coincide with the official opinions of Ottawa.

Well, he turned out to be right. As we got acquainted with the work of the editorial staff and its photo-typesetting shop, we looked through a few issues of the GLOBE AND MAIL lying in piles on desks in the editor's office. In one of them we read a letter to the paper from a married couple, John and Kirsti (Nilsen), published under the heading "Canada Should Refuse to Participate in 'Star Wars'." The letter recommends following the examples of Norway, Denmark and France, who refused Reagan's "star wars" program. The United States wants to destroy the strategic balance in the world, which could lead to extremely dangerous consequences. In developing its space program, the Nilsens noted, the USA is violating international legal standards and intensifying the arms race in space. "In the event that Canada joins Reagan's program," they stressed, "it will be furthering the nuclear arms race...and by the same token will hinder arms reduction negotiations between East and West. This will strengthen the threat to international peace and security, and will lead to enormous expenditures which could be used in fighting poverty and unemployment and which could raise the productivity of peaceful labor."

It should be noted that practically all Canadians think this way, regardless of their social position or political and religious convictions. In Ottawa we met with Canada's former ambassador to the USSR, now director of the International Institute for Peace and Security, D. Pearson. He told us that his institute was founded last year with the support of Canada's parliament and with the participation of all political parties. The purposes of the institute are to further the understanding of the ideas of peace and security among all the Canadian people and to carry out sociological research and public opinion polls.

"What do you think of the 'star wars' program?" we asked him.

"Approaching from a purely practical point of view," Pearson answered, "I have my doubts that it can be realized. Both Canadian and Soviet scholars hold this same opinion. There is one other aspect: the consequences of the program, without any doubt, will lead to aggravated relations between the USA and USSR, which is extremely undesirable."

Recalling his years spent in the Soviet Union, Pearson spoke warmly about our people. He said that he had come to love Siberia and its warm-hearted people; he added that Siberia with its spirit of discovery has many features in common with his own country.

There is one other question we would like to consider. American propaganda, which has several television channels of its own and exercises an influence on a number of local newspapers, is doing its utmost to instill the myth of a "Soviet threat" in the minds of the Canadian public. Washington has the naive idea that only in this case can the rhetoric about "defense" and "defense programs" create a smoke screen. Many well-known Canadian political and community figures are fighting resolutely against the USA's propaganda invasion, including honest Canadian journalists like Barry Zweicke. He travels around the country, appears on television and writes articles for various newspapers, uncovering all the falsehood and deception of the people who are conducting the psychological war against the Soviet Union. We promised to cite passages from his public statements and articles. Here they are.

"What are you doing?" he exclaims, appealing to the Canadian mass media in a speech at a rally in White Rock. "You are distorting life in the Soviet Union, or to put it more exactly, you always show its negative side. You should write widely and accurately about the USSR. Canadians can only gain from this, as can the cause of international peace."

Here is what he writes in the newspaper MCGILL DAILY: "Do you know why the standard of living is falling in the West? Only because of military spending. Think about these figures: 1 billion dollars invested for military purposes could give construction work to 100 thousand people or work in education to 177 thousand. They want to frighten you with communism and therefore they deprive you of your work and livelihood in the name of arms race. In the Montreal newspaper LINK, Barry Zweicke writes that the arms race is already killing us. It is limiting our food, taking away

our jobs, and people are becoming impoverished. Nobody in the world is threatening us, except those who, in their hatred for the Soviet Union, are pumping the bellows of militarism.

Canadians at all levels are beginning to understand more and more deeply the destructiveness of the USA's course in stepping up the arms race. This is expressed primarily in the growing antiwar movement. However, having lived through the stormy period of the anti-Soviet movement's rise, fighters for peace and disarmament more and more often ask themselves: which way do we go, what do we do now? In Canada there are many people who think that at this stage the first goal is to consolidate their strengths and create a general Canadian peace coalition. In the Country of the Maple Leaf there are now about a thousand organizations and groups which in one way or another have come out against the arms race. Many of them act spontaneously, without coordination. And there we have the first signs of what is to come. Not long ago in Vancouver a meeting was held with representatives of the basic antiwar organizations, which, in spite of some disagreements, demonstrated the determination of the majority of peace fighters to unite their efforts and to work out a general strategy and tactics for action. The idea of the need for a concerted joint struggle is asserting itself more and more among Canadian peace supporters.

The main thing is that "star wars" ideas are alien to Canada, and her people will not permit their country to be drawn into this dangerous undertaking. Canada is fighting for an immediate end to the testing of American winged ballistic missiles on her territory. The Canadian people want peace and the development of international collaboration.

12962

CSO: 5200/1344

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

ITALIAN CP'S PAJETTA ON SDI

PM091352 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 22 Sep 85 p 4

[Excerpt] Rome—"The government's attitude toward the attempt to involve Italy in Reagan's star wars policy will certainly be an important point in relations among our country's political forces." This was stated in an interview by Giancarlo Pajetta dealing with PCI/PSI relations, the Soviet new course, and the next PCI Congress.

"We deem it very important," Pajetta said, "to reject any participation in the star wars strategy, and also Italy's technological and economic involvement in the plans set out by the United States. We hope that the PSI holds a similar stance. When the PSI seemed to be expressing doubts and reluctance about the Euromissiles, we emphasized this as something positive, just as later we could not help emphasizing that, unfortunately, it was just a matter of words soon forgotten." "More than once," Pajetta continued, "we have demonstrated that we appreciate this government's foreign policy actions. I have in mind the Middle East, or the acceptance of the Spinelli proposal for an institutional reform of the EC. We do not have a pre-conceived antagonistic stance on international issues, even if this does not mean that every government action delights us. Sometimes it is difficult to understand how it is possible for us to conduct a useful dialogue only with Socialist and Social Democratic parties beyond our country's borders."

CSO: 5200/2521

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: REAGAN, SHEVARDNADZE DISCUSS GENEVA TALKS

Television Announcement

LD271834 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Sep 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report]

[Text] A meeting has been held in Washington between Comrade Shevardnadze and U.S. President Reagan. Over to our correspondent Vladimir Dunayev.

[Dunayev, seated at desk with backdrop of White House behind]

Seven weeks remain before the Soviet-American summit meeting. This is not long, but nevertheless there is still time, time to do quite a lot to ensure that the meeting in Geneva is constructive and useful -- if, of course, will is shown from both sides.

[Video shows car drawing up to entrance of building, Shevardnadze exiting and being met by Shultz; closeup of Shevardnadze seated with Reagan seated next to him in discussion; camera zooms in on Reagan; pan shot of room shows unidentified persons]

Not by accident, this is a stormy, wet day in Washington. Observers and reporters -- and not only American ones -- gathered at the White House where a conversation was held between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

It is too early to judge the nature of the current talks, but this is what should be noted. Our country is counting on an honest, unbiased dialogue at the Soviet-American summit meeting, and on a discussion of realistic problems; the approach must be a complex one, including the nonmilitarization of outer space.

The scenario for the November meeting is being determined to a considerable extent even now, by events which are happening today. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in his replies to the American TIME magazine: Our country's activities and our foreign political actions can be seen by all, and it is not by chance that the mood of the American people has been changing noticeably of late. Before, many people believed -- and were convinced of this -- that the United States was lagging behind the Soviet Union in the military aspect. Now, one has only to read and listen to the American people to hear that Washington is considerably behind Moscow in its desire to achieve a lasting peace, to achieve detente and accord. And it is a pretty hard thing to ignore the mood within one's own country.

These were the thoughts today when we were filming in the White House Oval Office where the conversation is being held between our foreign minister and the American President.

LD271913 Moscow TASS in English 1905 GMT 27 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, September 27 TASS -- Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze was received today by President Ronald Reagan of the United States and had a conversation with him.

He conveyed to the President a message from the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev outlining his concrete considerations and proposals in connection with the Soviet-American summit meeting planned for November this year in Geneva. These considerations concern first of all questions that are the subject of the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms. It was agreed that the exchange of views on these and other questions in preparation for the summit meeting will be continued.

Both sides regard the conversation as important and useful.

Present at the conversation from the Soviet side were First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Georgiy Korniyenko and the USSR Ambassador in the United States Anatoliy Dobrynin; from the American side -- Vice President George Bush, Secretary of State George Shultz, head of the White House staff Donald Regan and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Robert McFarlane.

President Reagan held a luncheon in Shevardnadze's honour.

TASS Correction

Moscow TASS in English at 1024 GMT on 27 September carries a "corrected version" of the preceding item, amending it as follows:

Paragraph four, only line, reads: ...as important and mutually beneficial. (changing "useful" to "mutually beneficial")

Lomeyko Press Conference Remarks

LD272321 Moscow TASS in English 2314 GMT 27 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, September 28 TASS -- A press conference was held in the National Press Club Friday [27 September] in connection with a meeting between the member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and President Reagan of the United States. Speaking at the press conference, the member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, head of the Press Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Vladimir Lomeyko said that during the meeting a message of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev had been handed over to the President. The message sets forth concrete ideas and proposals in connection with the coming summit meeting due to be held in Geneva next November. These ideas deal, in the first place, with the questions discussed at the Geneva talks.

It was stressed at the press conference that the conversation held with the President was undoubtedly important and mutually useful. The Soviet representative pointed out that the exchange of views on those and other questions as part of preparations for the summit meeting would be continued.

23 October 1985

Vladimir Lomeyko answered numerous questions of American and foreign journalists. Specifically, in answer to a question about the Soviet "star peace" concept he recalled that Eduard Shevardnadze, when speaking at the U.N., drew the attention of participants in the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly to the new Soviet proposal -- on international cooperation in peaceful use of outer space in conditions of its non-militarization.

We propose not to launch weapons into space, but to conduct peaceful space research which would be beneficial to mankind in general, including the countries which at the moment do not possess the needed potential for such research, V. Lomeyko stressed. It is for this purpose that the Soviet Union suggested that a world space organization be set up and that a world space conference be held no later than in 1987, he pointed out. Space which belongs to all should remain peaceful. This is the essence of the Soviet concept of star peace, it was underlined at the press conference.

Meeting With Shultz

LD280326 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0245 GMT 28 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, 28 Sep (TASS) -- Another meeting of E. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs, with U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz took place here.

They continued their exchange of opinions on the issues discussed during talks between the Soviet minister and the U.S. President in connection with the forthcoming meeting of Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

Along with a wide range of issues concerning limiting and reducing armaments, a number of regional problems were touched upon in the conversation.

Some issues of bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and the United States were also discussed, with an eye to their possible resolution as a matter of preparation for the Soviet-American summit.

CSO: 5200/1033

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER REBUTS REAGAN STATEMENTS ON TALKS

PM261201 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Sep 85 Second Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Borin article under the "Notes A Propos" rubric: "Whom To Believe?"]

[Text] Judging from Western press reports, U.S. political and public circles are increasingly frequently voicing grave misgivings about prospects for further development of the strategic arms limitation process. In view of the stance adopted by the U.S. side at the previous two rounds of the Geneva talks, experts conclude that the process as a whole may even be disrupted through the fault of the United States.

However, the White House is stubbornly trying to attribute its own sins to the Soviet Union. The entire military and political array, including the President himself, has joined in the anti-Soviet propaganda campaign. "It was the Soviet Union, not we, who refused to hold talks for many months in Geneva..." R. Reagan peremptorily stated at a recent press conference. "We proposed a minimum of six options for possible reductions and six different methods of reducing the number of warheads so as to interest them in discussion with us. They offered nothing in exchange. They simply do not want to discuss this question or to hold talks on this topic."

A verbatim report of the President's statement was distributed through the office of the White House press secretary. And everyone who read it could not help wondering: Can it be the United States which is actually working to curb the arms race while the true culprit is the USSR?

However, the White House press service was clearly concerned by the patent falsity of the President's statements. Immediately after Reagan's statement his press officers organized a series of briefings, no longer public but strictly confidential. At them, representatives of the mass media were addressed by other administration spokesmen. They appealed to the sensation-seeking Western journalists... not to believe the President's "revelations." For example, R. McFarlane, who actively participated in these "clarifications," said that Reagan "was not accurate" when stating the U.S. delegation in Geneva presented the Soviet side with six options for reducing strategic offensive arms. The President actually meant, apparently, that the United States only has six options of this kind which it could ever put into circulation.

The Western mass media report that, in the opinion of a number of members of the White House chief's entourage, the President's "injudicious and inaccurate" comments were probably the result of his being "too well-prepared" for the press conference or, more accurately, the result of the unconstructive U.S. approach to the summit meeting and

the Geneva talks. And, to be blunt, not quite honest approach. Since the Washington administration loudly accuses the Soviet Union of every conceivable and inconceivable crime with characteristic American bombast while admitting its own lie only at "confidential briefings...."

No further comment is needed.

CSO: 5200/1033

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW TV: 'STILL OPPORTUNITIES' DESPITE U.S. ACTIONS

PM292152 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 29 Sep 85

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] People are not losing hope that real results will be attained on the way toward limiting the arms race. The Soviet Union has put forward a broad program of specific proposals which aim to strengthen international security and remove the threat of war. For the time being, however, the United States is demonstratively rejecting any Soviet peace initiative. The United States answered our country's unilateral introduction of a moratorium on underground nuclear explosions by carrying out another nuclear explosion. In response to the USSR's proposal for peaceful cooperation in space under conditions of nonmilitarization, the United States carried out a combat test of the ASAT antisatellite system against a real target in space.

As of yet, nothing comforting can be said in regard to the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons, either. We can start with the fact that the U.S. delegation arrived at the third round of negotiations without any fresh initiatives whatsoever, or even shifts in their position compared to the two previous rounds; it is known that these ended without results. It seems as if the United States is counting on carrying on an endless discussion in Geneva; it has even decided to build a house there for its delegation on the supposition, evidently, that the delegation will have to stay on in Geneva for many a long year.

Tactics such as these are well-known and we have no intention of playing along with the White House in this.

At one time Washington, using negotiations as a cover, was preparing to deploy new U.S. missiles in Western Europe; now, however, it is preparing to implement President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, that is to say, the "star wars" plans. The White House boss himself confirmed this. Reagan expressed his opposition to any agreement that would ban the creation of space strike weapons. If this is the President's last word on this issue, the prospects for the whole world will be sober, the U.S. weekly, *NEWSWEEK*, thus wrote. Writing in the journal, the West German publicist Theodor Sommer comments: Arms control will be the first victim of the Strategic Defense Initiative. The second victim will be the prospects for reducing tension and developing cooperation between two great powers. If the Geneva meeting ends in failure, an arms race will begin which is unlimited either in expenditure or in duration or in the danger it presents and a new cold war will break out, Sommer underlines. It is not often that one meets with such a sober evaluation of the events taking place in U.S. bourgeois publication. This indisputably reflects the alarm felt by the Western public over the bellicose space plans of the White House.

Meanwhile however, a wide-scale anti-Soviet campaign is being unleashed. One cannot but suspect this is a sort of propaganda preparation for an effort to wreck the forthcoming summit meeting. One of the leading roles in this propaganda spectacle has been assumed by Defense Secretary Weinberger. To judge by all events, he is against negotiations in general, for they do not enter into the Pentagon's plans. Speaking about the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting, Weinberger constantly expresses himself to be against any exaggerated expectations in regard to this dialogue. According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, his behavior irritates even a number of Washington officials.

Weinberger, however, speaks with the blessing of the White House. In any case, a White House spokesman explained that the public statements by the Pentagon boss reflect the essence of his private conversations with the President.

Washington frequently has had the opportunity to convince itself that this sort of political baddling will bring the United States nothing. We are capable of responding to any challenge. But is it necessary to pursue the path of confrontation? This creates situations in which both sides will lose.

There is still time before the summit meeting; there are still opportunities to make it constructive and useful. The Soviet Union has the will to normalize relations with the United States, this was stated by Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze when he spoke from the tribune of the UN General Assembly. The Soviet Union countered Washington's plans for "star wars" with a proposal for "star peace," a program of international cooperation in the peaceful use of space under conditions of its nonmilitarization. If this new Soviet initiative meets a positive response from the West, the international community will come closer to attaining the goals of the United Nations, which proclaimed 1986 the year of peace.

CSO: 5200/1033

MOSCOW REVIEWS FIRST TWO ROUNDS OF GENEVA TALKS

LD311114 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 31 Aug 85

[From the "Time, Events, and People" program; review of listeners' letters presented by political observer Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Excerpt] I should like, esteemed listeners, to begin the review of your letters with a letter from Comrade Turkin, who lives in the settlement of Redkino in Kalinin Oblast. In connection with the approach of the third round of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space armaments, Comrade Turkin has asked us to recall how the second round ended.

Before the beginning of the talks in Geneva, the sides agreed that the subject for the talks would be the complex of questions concerning space and nuclear armaments, both strategic and medium range. The purpose of the talks, both sides agreed, should be drawing up effective accords directed at averting an armaments race in space and at halting the arms race on earth. All the issues at the talks were to be considered and resolved as a whole and in an interrelated way.

During two rounds of the talks, the United States has done nothing to bring the talks nearer to their goal. As you know, the Soviet Union's unilaterally declared moratorium on being the first to launch antisatellite weapons into outer space has now been in operation for 2 years. Continuing its efforts for peace, the Soviet Union proposed during the first round that a moratorium on nuclear and space armaments be imposed for the duration of the talks. The United States, however, was against this. It advocated that both sides engage in developing a program for an offensive space weapons race and only later begin to seek a stable combination of offensive and defensive forces. In connection with an overall method for averting an arms race in space, the USSR proposed that agreement be reached on a radical reduction in strategic forces and a renunciation of the creation of new types of strategic armaments. By its halting of the deployment of medium-range missiles beginning in April and the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe, the Soviet Union created an atmosphere in which it would have been quite possible to agree also on reducing medium-range nuclear weapons on the European Continent. The United States, however, heaped up so many obstacles in both these areas of the talks that there was no success in achieving agreements.

Before the third round of the talks, the U.S. position on nuclear and military space questions does not inspire optimism. The United States does not want to join the moratorium on all nuclear explosions that has been declared by the Soviet Union. It is negative in its approach to the Soviet proposal for international cooperation in the peaceful conquest of space under conditions of its nonmilitarization. The United States has announced combat tests of antisatellite weapons in space. The Soviet Union intends, nevertheless, to continue the struggle to avert an arms race in space and to halt the arms race on earth. After all, mankind's future depends on the success of this struggle.

CSO: 5200/1033

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR REPORTS ON THIRD ROUND MEETINGS

Strategic Arms Group 25 Sep

LD251103 Moscow TASS in English 1046 GMT 25 Sep 85

[Text] Geneva, 25 Sep (TASS)--The group on strategic arms at Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons held a meeting here today within the negotiations' framework.

Medium-Range Group 26 Sep

LD261128 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 26 Sep 85

[Text] Geneva, 26 Sep (TASS)--The group on medium-range nuclear armaments held a meeting here today within the framework of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

Plenary Meeting 30 Sep

LD301603 Moscow TASS in English 1554 GMT 30 Sep 85

[Text] Geneva, 30 Sep (TASS)--A plenary meeting of the Soviet and American delegations at the talks on nuclear and space arms was held here today.

Space Weapons Group 30 Sep

LD301140 Moscow TASS in English 1124 GMT 30 Sep 85

[Text] Geneva, 30 Sep (TASS)--A session of the group for space weapons was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons.

Plenary Meeting 1 Oct

LD011256 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] Geneva, 1 Oct (TASS)--Soviet and U.S. delegations to talks on nuclear and space arms held their second plenary meeting this week here today.

As has become known, the focus of attention is now on new proposals tabled by the Soviet side.

Leader of the Soviet delegation Viktor Karpov told journalists that these proposals are aimed at achieving a radical solution to the entire complex of problems, which are the subject of the Geneva negotiations, in keeping with the principle of equality and equal security.

Karpov Discusses New Proposals

AU011237 Paris AFP in English 1224 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] Geneva, Oct 1 (AFP) -- The Soviet delegation to the superpower arms reduction talks here today resumed its expose of new proposals, started yesterday, chief delegate Viktor Karpov said.

It would be "premature" to say anything about the U.S. reaction, he added. The proposals were outlined to U.S. President Ronald Reagan by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze last Friday in Washington.

Mr. Karpov said the proposals were "balanced," covering all three areas of discussion -- strategic (long-range) and medium range nuclear weapons, and space weapons. They offered "drastic solutions."

Mr. Karpov said the Soviet Union did not oppose basic research on the problems posed by U.S. "star wars" space-defence intentions, but was against any research "leading to space-based striking weapons."

The third round of arms reduction talks here began on September 19, and is expected to end early in November, a few days before the planned summit here between Soviet party chief Mikhail Gorbachev and Mr. Reagan.

CSO: 5200/1033

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET WEEKLY ON PROSPECTS FOR GENEVA TALKS, CDE, MBFR

PM181312 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 36, Sep 85 pp 3-4

[Gennadiy Stakh article: "Stereotype Prenuclear-Age Thinking: What's Blocking Progress on Issues of International Security"]

[Text] The recent major Soviet foreign policy actions were received by governments, political circles and the international public at large as a manifestation of a responsible and farsighted policy. The Soviet Union has again demonstrated the dynamism of its peaceable foreign policy, its resolve to do everything possible to avert the war danger and improve the international climate. On its proposal, the item "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in Conditions of its Non-Militarization" has been included in the agenda of the 40th Session of the UN General Assembly due to open on September 17.

The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that mankind faces the following choice: Either outer space will be yielding ever more tangible results for improving the conditions of the life of the peoples, or it will become a source of a new lethal danger. Quite obviously the only sensible option is to press for outer space to remain peaceful. This is what Moscow urges.

By its new initiative the Soviet Union has confirmed once again that it has no intention of putting arms into outer space, that it is against competition in the field of space arms, just as it is against competition in armaments in general. Our country counters the "star wars" plan with its peace plans for space. The new Soviet proposal envisages a programme of joint effort of states in the non-militarization of outer space, in its peaceful exploration with the object of satisfying the economic and social requirements of all nations.

The USSR is prepared generously to share its accomplishments in space science and technology. Joint exploration of outer space and joint utilization of outer space and joint utilization of the results of space studies in the interests of all is perfectly feasible provided all channels of militarizing near-earth space are effectively blocked. A programme of concrete proposals on this score has been submitted by the Soviet Union to the UN General Assembly in its draft "Main Directions and Principles of International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in Conditions of its Non-Militarization."

In conditions of the non-militarization of space we propose to move on to a qualitatively new stage of international cooperation in its exploration and use. This opens up the possibility of using a huge research, technological and industrial potential

for solving the global problems confronting mankind. Assistance to the developing states of Asia, Africa and Latin America is a task of special importance. The USSR hold that they should enter the space era together with all other countries as equal partners. Our country proposes that an international conference with the participation of states possessing a big space potential be convened not later than 1987 to study in its entirety the question of cooperation in the peaceful exploration and uses of outer space, in particular the question of setting up a world space organization. The world public has every right to expect that the UN General Assembly will adopt the relevant concrete decisions.

The problem of preventing the militarization of outer space constitutes one of the main directions of the Soviet peace offensive.

People the world over followed with keen interest the meeting of the foreign ministers of 33 European countries, the United States and Canada in Helsinki devoted to the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act on security and cooperation in Europe. Despite the disparity of views and positions that manifested itself during the discussion that meeting revealed common concern for the destiny of peace on the continent and our planet as a whole.

The lessons of the ten years of the Helsinki process show that in the nuclear and space era politics should be more responsible and realistic than ever before. That by concerted effort it is possible to find solutions to the most challenging international problems. That it is precisely on the road of detente set forth in the Final Act that a reliable peace and extensive cooperation among states can be achieved. That to safeguard European and world security it is necessary to end confrontation and take concrete steps towards disarmament and the building of confidence.

The Soviet Union confirmed once again in Helsinki its unswerving fidelity to the principles and provisions of the Final Act.

Mikhail Gorbachev's announcement of the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear blasts was received with hope at the meeting in Helsinki. This courageous decision by the Soviet leadership is new evidence of the consistency of the USSR's efforts to eliminate the nuclear menace.

Calling for a revival of detente, the USSR views it as a necessary transitional stage to reliable security for all. That time will come when the world is freed from the burden of armaments. It is with this credo that the Soviet Union went to the talks in Geneva, Vienna and Stockholm. At all these forums we have made realistic proposals designed to drastically lessen the risk of an armed clash, subsequently to eliminate the nuclear threat completely and to strengthen security in Europe and the world in general. As we see it, the Soviet proposals offer a chance of finding a satisfactory solution to the problems that are being discussed at all these forums on the only possible basis -- the basis of equality and equal security.

Take, for instance, the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space arms. Whether we succeed in preventing outer space being turned into a sphere of military rivalry or whether, on the contrary, mankind will come perilously close to the fateful line of a nuclear holocaust depends on the outcome of these talks. Such is the choice today. The USSR has come to Geneva with the firm intention of reaching an honest, mutually acceptable accord on all the three aspects of the talks. As to the key issue -- that of preventing an arms race in outer space -- the USSR has proposed banning the entire category of space strike weapons. It is necessary to reach agreement on the

prohibition (at the stage of research) of their development, testing and deployment, and on the destruction of such types of armaments already existing, i.e., anti-satellite systems. At the same time, the USSR has proposed reaching agreement on a considerable reduction of strategic arms (in terms both of delivery vehicles and the number of warheads they carry).

The USSR has made far-reaching proposals in the field of medium-range arms in Europe as well: along with the withdrawal of U.S. Pershings and cruise missiles from European countries to reduce the analogous Soviet missiles in the European zone to such a level that by number of warheads they would be equivalent to the respective armaments of Britain and France. In this way the confrontation between the United States and the USSR in these armaments would really be reduced to nil. The Soviet Union has confirmed its readiness to reach agreement also on such a radical step as ridding Europe entirely of both medium-range and tactical nuclear arms.

In short, Moscow is doing everything possible to promote the success of the talks.

We have proposed introducing a moratorium on nuclear and space arms for the entire period of the talks. Besides, since April the USSR has stopped the deployment of its medium-range missiles and the implementation of other measures taken in response to the deployment of the new U.S. missiles in Europe.

The set of Soviet proposals unquestionably creates a good basis for productive work in Geneva. Why, then, is there no real progress after two rounds of the talks? The U.S. position is the impediment. Contrary to the Soviet-American accord of January 8 on the subject and aims of the talks, Washington evades discussion of questions concerning space strike weapons, thus showing its reluctance to take measures to limit and reduce nuclear arms as well.

Without prevention of the militarization of outer space it is impossible to move on to a serious reduction of nuclear arms, this being determined by objective military, technological and political factors. Neither has Washington made any serious proposals at the talks on the two other questions under discussion -- strategic arms and medium-range weapons. It is not difficult to guess why. The U.S. does not want to create obstacles for itself in carrying out the "star wars" and other programmes of accelerating nuclear arms buildup. As to the Geneva talks, judging by everything, the very fact of their being held is enough for the United States; the attainment of concrete results is not included in its plans....

The White House has reduced to naught the work of the Disarmament Conference in Geneva. Contrary to the decision of the 39th UN General Assembly, adopted by an absolute majority vote on the USSR's initiative, on the drafting at the conference of measures to prevent an arms race in outer space, the U.S. has blocked the holding of talks.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have submitted to the conference detailed proposals on the coordination of urgent measures to avert nuclear war, on drafting a stage-by-stage programme of nuclear disarmament and a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. Non-aligned and neutral countries demand the working out of practical measures along these directions. And what is the stand taken by the U.S.? When answering questions put by a TASS correspondent Mikhail Gorbachev noted that at the Disarmament Conference "the United States and other Western countries have been sabotaging the conduct of such talks for a long time." Washington is also obstructing the drafting of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, although certain progress has been achieved here on the basis of proposals made by the USSR and a number of other countries.

The Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe have been deadlocked for some time. Here, too, the reason is the reluctance of the United States and some other NATO countries to reach agreement, to reciprocate the constructive steps taken by socialist states. The proposal submitted by the USSR and its allies in February is on the negotiating table in Vienna. It is proposed within the period of one year to reduce the Soviet and U.S. ground forces in that area by 20,000 and 13,000 men respectively. After that, all the states party to the agreement would refrain for two years from increasing the level of their armed forces and armaments in central Europe. Provision is made for adequate verification measures, including the creation by each side -- for the duration of the troop-reduction withdrawal -- of three or four observation posts at the points through which the troops would be withdrawn. These initial reductions are to be followed by talks on the establishment of equal and lower collective levels for the armed forces of both alliances in that area.

In the opinion of the USSR more dynamic progress is needed at the Stockholm conference as well. The time has come for practical accords on large-scale mutually and complementary confidence-building measures in both the political and military fields.

The socialist countries have submitted balanced and constructive proposals on this matter. Like the proposals of non-aligned and neutral countries, they offer good possibilities for the success of this forum. The question of the non-use of military force in relations between states, raised by socialist countries, has become the central issue at the conference. Proceeding from the entire experience of struggle for the implementation of this fundamental principle of the United Nations Charter, the socialist countries proposed that it be put on record in more detailed form, made more concrete as applied to present-day conditions.

The proposals of the USSR and other socialist countries on limiting the scale of military exercises in Europe, on notification of large-scale land, air and naval exercises and also on major troop movements and transfers demonstrate their readiness to reach agreement on mutually acceptable military confidence-building measures going much farther than those envisaged by the Final Act.

Meanwhile the U.S. and NATO are trying to get the forum in Stockholm to adopt measures in the military sphere that would leave intact the entire U.S. military potential on its territory and the sea spaces adjoining Europe and provide them with intelligence information on the Soviet Union's military potential. One cannot seriously expect the USSR and its allies to agree to measures that have nothing to do with confidence-building and can only damage their security.

The world community expects that substantial accords will be reached at the talks in Geneva, Vienna and Stockholm, accords capable of barring the arms race from outer space, stopping it on earth, increasing trust, strengthening the security of all.

It is necessary to discard the stereotype thinking typical of the pre-nuclear age and overcome the urge to acquire instant but transient advantages at the expense of the security of others. It is necessary to give up attempts to impose acceptable solutions on negotiating partners, to outwit the other side and to conduct talks with the sole object of never reaching agreement. It is time for the West to start looking for mutually acceptable, honest solutions.

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS: U.S. STRATEGIC ARMS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM GROWS

LD292242 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1235 GMT 29 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, 29 Sep (TASS) -- TASS correspondent I. Borisenko reports: The Pentagon is spending more and more millions of dollars on perfecting strategic arms systems. As the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST reports, the U.S. Air Force has offered the Boeing Corporation a contract worth \$6 million to study a new concept of basing nuclear first strike systems, the MX ICBM. It is proposed to house the missile, the launcher, and the electronic launch control equipment in a special high-strength container which could be transported from one launch silo to another. In the words of Senator P. Wilson, a Republican from California and a member of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, the new way of basing the MX missile "must make their detection more difficult". A spokesman for the U.S. military department said that recommendations on the new means of basing will be presented for examination by a special scientific group at the Pentagon during the year. In addition, he pointed out, "alternative options" are being looked at for the deployment of MX missiles.

These measures are only part of a large-scale program being implemented by Washington to perfect and build up its nuclear might. Development of a new mobile ICBM "Midgetman" is under way at an accelerated rate. The U.S. Air Force has begun arming itself with the most up-to-date B-1B strategic bombers and the development of yet another strategic bomber, Stealth, is in the final stage. The U.S. Air Force already has several atomic submarines of the Trident class, each of which is equipped with 24 Trident-I intercontinental missiles. In 1989 the Pentagon is planning to begin deployment of new Trident-II missiles on these submarines, intended for making a first nuclear strike.

CSO: 5200/1035

SALT/START ISSUES

BRIEFS

TASS ON MINUTEMAN-3 TEST--San Francisco, 26 Sep (TASS)--A Minuteman-3 ICBM has been test launched from the Vandenberg Air Force Base in California. According to a spokesman for the U.S. Air Force, the missile capable of carrying three nuclear warheads was aimed at the Kwajalein Atoll in the western Pacific. UPI says that it was the 111th launch in the series of tests of strategic nuclear carriers conducted by the United States. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1821 GMT 26 Sep 85]

CSO: 5200/1050

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS CITES BELGIAN PREMIER: DEPLOYMENT DECISION 'IMPOSED' BY U.S.

LD211952 Moscow TASS in English 1932 GMT 21 Sep 85

[Text] Brussels, 21 Sep (TASS)--Belgium's Prime Minister Wilfried Martens has admitted that the decision to deploy U.S. cruise missiles in Belgium was actually imposed on Brussels by the White House.

In an autobiographic book, published here, W. Martens calls in question the need of the haste with which NATO strategists passed in 1979 the decision to deploy close to 600 U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe. According to W. Martens, he found himself in a rather difficult position. All attempts to get any changes have failed due to the course of Washington which insisted on the siting of its nuclear missile weapons cost what it may.

The head of the Belgium Government writes that during his latest trip to Washington last January the U.S. President said "no" to Belgium's proposal on delaying for some time the issue of the deployment of missiles as a positive gesture towards the USSR.

As a result, faced with strong pressure from the United States, the W. Martens government in March 1985 gave its consent to accept U.S. cruise missiles on Belgian soil in defiance to the fact that an overwhelming majority of the Belgian population opposed and continue opposing this perilous venture which has converted Belgium into a nuclear hostage of the Pentagon.

CSO: 5200/1035

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DUTCH CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENTS AGAINST INF REJECTED

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 21 Sep 85 p 6

[Article by S.W. Couwenberg, professor of Constitutional Law and Administrative Law at Erasmus University: "Gaullist Arguments Against Cruise Missiles"]

[Text] What is noteworthy to me in the grim struggle against the siting of cruise missiles is that on certain points arguments are used which sound more or less Gaullist. Characteristic of Gaullism is, among other things, a stress on the national sovereignty vis-a-vis the tendency to subordinate this sovereignty to the demands of international development and cooperation, and the involvement of the voters in referendums in the exercise of this sovereignty.

In the struggle against the deployment decision too there is an appeal made to our national sovereignty which is hollowed out by this deployment and further to the voters via a national petition which in fact is treated as a disguised consultative referendum.

Ambiguity

In the NRC HANDELSBLAD of last 14 September, F. Kok again raised the question whether the deployment of cruise missiles did not mean an infraction of our sovereignty and thus a contravention of our constitution and whether therefore the treaty to be concluded with the United States did not require a two-thirds majority. In this context he referred to an article by PvdA Second Chamber member K.de Vries, who again defended this standpoint in SOCIALISME EN DEMOCRATIE magazine. The following may be said in opposition to this view.

In contrast to other constitutions, there is no clear statement in our constitution on the principle of national sovereignty. In the literature on constitutional law also there is no agreement on the question as to where the sovereign, highest authority is located. In view of this ambiguity, there is a wide margin of constitutional leeway in the matter of the problem of sovereignty.

One can indeed say that the principle of national sovereignty is implicitly at the basis of our form of government, but at the same time it must be noted that we have deliberately relativized this principle after the war. Namely, we as a nation have consciously chosen international cooperation as a means for maintaining our national sovereignty.

As a result of this, the Netherlands has subsequently accepted clear limitations on its sovereignty: on the one hand in the framework of the collective security system of the United Nations, and on the other hand--when this system was not functioning well--in the framework of the Atlantic alliance. Through this membership the Netherlands has been for years part of the North Atlantic association, led by the United States, for the protection of freedom and democracy and of the sovereignty of the member states. We have thus chosen in principle for an internationalization of the external security policy.

The loss of sovereignty which was linked to this has never in the past years led to any doubt of the constitutionality of the treaty which form the legal basis of the internationalization. One of the most characteristic aspects of our postwar political culture concerning international relations is a very positive assessment of the limitation of national sovereignty for the benefit of international cooperation.

In the European Community this attitude is expressed in a preference in principle for a supranational orientation. By its membership in NATO, our country has deliberately relinquished its exclusive national responsibility for its own defense. As is well known, France has to an important extent gone back on this in 1966 at the instigation of DeGaulle by withdrawing from the NATO integrated defense system and France has given real content to its own national defense responsibility by building up its own nuclear power potential. In our country this has always been rejected as an expression of obsolete nationalism.

Taboo

In view of the above, it is very remarkable that in the discussion over cruise missiles, certain circles who are known to be progressive are now reverting back to the principle of national sovereignty, which in our country has been more or less taboo for years in the framework of international relations, since it is an expression of nationalist sentiment which no longer fits in a time of increasing international interdependence.

The relativization of our sovereignty in international law has also received a constitutional confirmation since the constitutional revision of 1953. This relativization is expressed such that international law (treaty stipulations and decisions by organizations of international law) is given direct legal force and even precedence above national legislation (including the constitution) and that the transfer of government powers to international organizations is expressly made possible.

The constitution relativization of sovereignty according to international law also forms the point of departure for the advice of the Council of State on the cruise missile question. The council is of the opinion that a treaty does not violate the constitution merely because it is linked to a loss of sovereignty. This is also seen in the history connected with the conclusion of international agreements. It is only a question of a violation if treaty stipulations conflict with specific stipulations of the constitution.

The council then investigated whether the treaty to be concluded with the United States on the deployment of cruise missiles conflicts directly or indirectly with specific constitutional stipulations, namely articles 92, 96, 97 and 98 and additionally article XI of the constitution. That appears not to be the case. Therefore the approval of this treaty does not require 2/3 majority of the votes given, as is required by article 91 section 3 of the constitution if there is any sort of conflict with the constitution.

Insofar as the use of cruise missiles from out of Dutch territory is not conditioned on Dutch approval (the single-key system), a government power is waived, that is the power to prevent this use. But this waiver is not in conflict with the constitution, in this case article 92. This article namely does not mean that government powers may only be transferred to international organizations.

In this connection, the Council of State recalls the history of the predecessor of this constitutional article--article 67 of the constitution of 1953, which shows that actually no constitutional basis is needed for the transfer of government powers to international organs. The authority to do so is derived from the other stipulations concerning treaties. That this pertinent stipulation was nevertheless adopted into the constitution, was done exclusively to put beyond a doubt the constitutionality of such a transfer.

In view of the constitutional relativization of the national sovereignty and the postwar political culture as to international relations with its positive view on the limitation of national sovereignty for the sake of international cooperation, the single-key system can be defended very well from a constitutional aspect.

CSO: 5200/2508

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

SOVIET GEN TATARNIKOV DENOUNCES NATO EXERCISES

LD301624 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT 30 Sep 85

[Text] Stockholm, September 30 TASS -- Member of the Soviet delegation Major-General Viktor Tatarnikov today made a speech at the meeting of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence - and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. The holding by the United States and NATO member countries of large-scale military exercises, involving hundreds of thousands men, thousands of tanks, combatant planes, warships and other equipment fitted out with nuclear weapons is a manifestation of the policy of strength, leads to the growth of tension, he said.

The Soviet representative reaffirmed the proposal of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty-member states on limitation of proportions of military exercises of troops to the level of 40,000 men. Attainment of accords on that question will promote restoration of confidence and consolidation of security in Europe.

CSO: 5200/1035

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

SOVIET COUNTERPROPOSAL ON MUTUAL NOTIFICATION

AU041808 Paris AFP in English 1759 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Stockholm, Oct 4 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union is willing to participate in mutual notification of military activities in order to reduce the risks of conflict in Europe, the Soviet delegate to the Conference on Disarmament in Europe (CDE) here said today according to a diplomatic source.

Oleg Grinevskiy was responding to measures proposed here by Western and neutral countries.

Mr. Grinevskiy thus continued the "peace offensive" Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev is waging in Paris, where he has proposed a 50 per cent reduction in U.S. and Soviet strategic weapons and direct talks between the Soviet Union and Western European nuclear powers France and Britain.

Mr. Grinevskiy went too far, however, according to Western delegates, in proposing that air and naval maneuvers be included in the "calendars" to be exchanged, the source said.

The Western delegates feel that the CDE mandate only covers land, and possibly amphibious, operations.

CSO: 5200/1050

USSR'S ISRAELYAN COMMENTS ON RESULTS OF SUMMER SESSION

LD301405 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 30 Aug 85

[Text] Geneva, 30 Aug (TASS)--The summer session of the disarmament conference ended at the Palace of Nations here today. The session discussed a wide range of questions connected with the quest of the solution of problems of ending the arms race, concluding a treaty banning chemical weapons. The conference also paid much attention to questions of preventing nuclear war, comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests and a number of other questions.

Summing up the results of the session, head of the Soviet delegation Viktor Israelyan said that while the Soviet Union and socialist countries jointly with nonaligned states had been persistently pursuing the line at achievement of concrete results, the United States and its allies had been exerting efforts in the opposite direction.

The results of the conference's work are reflected in its report which will be submitted to a regular session of the United Nations General Assembly.

CSO: 5200/1039

ICELANDIC PROPOSAL ON NORDIC NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE

Reykjavik THJODVILJINN in Icelandic 6 Sep 85 p 1

[Text] The Icelandic and Nordic delegates to the UN have proposed that nuclear-free-zones must be established, that we must stop the arms race. Ingvi Ingvason of the Foreign Ministry says that this is in agreement with the policy of the Foreign Ministry. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee says that he has not seen the proposal. Hjorleifur Guttormsson says that he is very pleased that Iceland is involved in presenting the proposal.

"The proposal has been signed on behalf of the Icelandic nation, and I believe that it was done with the full agreement of the foreign minister. I cannot see that there is anything in the document which our Foreign Ministry representatives would not sign," said Ingvi Ingvason, ministry head from the Foreign Ministry, in an interview with THJODVILJINN yesterday, when he was asked his opinion on the disarmament proposals from Nordic diplomats which were presented to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Conference in Geneva. The issue has not yet been discussed in the Althing's Foreign Affairs Committee.

The letter was signed on behalf of the Icelandic government on 15 July by Hordur Helgason, Icelandic delegate to the United Nations. In addition to Helgason, delegates from Denmark, Sweden, Finland and Norway also signed the document.

The five delegates said in their letter to the conference, which was held to reexamine the agreement which was made in 1968 banning the proliferation of nuclear weapons, that the governments of their nations thought that the following steps would have to be taken, among other things, in order to make it possible for the proliferation ban to be effective:

--Decisions made by the relevant super powers relating to nuclear weapons, and weapons in space, should attempt to forestall an arms race in space and to halt the nuclear arms race.

--Nuclear-free-zones would need to be established, with the agreement of the nations involved.

--International agreements would need to be made assuring that nuclear weapons would not be used against nations that have no access to such weapons; nor would they be threatened with nuclear attack.

"I have not seen the document, nor has it come before the Foreign Affairs Committee," said Eyjolfur Konrad Jonsson, chairman of the Althing's Foreign Affairs Committee, when THJODVILJINN mentioned it to him yesterday.

"Of course it is something to be very pleased about that Iceland is involved in a disarmament agreement of this kind, and I believe that it is in full agreement with the Althing's foreign affairs decisions from last spring," said Hjorleifur Guttormsson, MP and the representative of the People's Alliance Party in the Althing's Foreign Affairs Committee.

The conference to reexamine the nuclear non-proliferation treaty began in Geneva on 27 August, and will probably conclude by the end of September. Iceland has two delegates attending the conference.

Foreign Minister Geir Hallgrimsson was not available for comment yesterday.

9584

CSO:5200/2781

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: FRG, GDR PARTIES TO BEGIN TALKS ON C. EUROPEAN ZONE

LD262121 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 26 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, September 26 TASS -- TASS commentator Lev Aksenov writes:

The leaders of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (West Germany) have set up a special commission with Egon Bahr at the head which will start talks in November with the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (GDR) on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in central Europe.

The problem of the creation in various parts of the planet of the zones free from mass destruction weapons acquires special topicality today. At present when the U.S. Administration and the North Atlantic bloc are stepping up the arms race, including nuclear arms race, these steps can considerably facilitate the attaining of the ultimate goal -- the turning of the globe into a zone free from all the types of mass destruction weapons.

Central Europe today is the region with the world's biggest concentration of armed forces and armaments.

This is why such initiatives as the proposal of Sweden to proclaim that area to be a zone free from battlefield nuclear weapons, as well as the proposal of the Governments of the GDR and Czechoslovakia to the Government of West Germany to start talks on the creation in central Europe of a zone free from chemical weapons meet with so broad a response.

It is deplorable that the high-ranking Bonn officials with whose consent the West German territory has been turned into a gigantic NATO arsenal of the most up-to-date armaments do not display a realistic approach to the constructive initiatives on military detente in the centre of the European Continent.

CSO: 5200/1035

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR: 'ANTI-SOVIET BLINDERS' PREVENT WEAPONS TEST BAN

PM011525 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Sep 85 Second Edition p 5

[Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Yurkin under the Rubric of Apropos": "In the Blinders of Anti-Sovietism"]

[Text] In preparing for the Soviet-American summit meeting the USSR is striving to create the most favorable climate for the talks and to do everything possible to strengthen peace and security. In the recent past alone the Soviet Union has put forward a number of important peace initiatives, including the announcement of a unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions and a call to the United States to follow this example. "Our proposals for curtailing the race in all kinds of armaments are on the negotiating table," M.S. Gorbachev stressed at his meeting with J. Rau, deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and prime minister of North Rhine-Westphalia. "And if the relevant states, primarily the United States, are willing to negotiate on all these questions which concern the fate of the whole peoples, this can be done effectively and without delays."

However, by all accounts it is this desire that the United States does not possess. Judge for yourself. "The position which I am able to expound is the position which the President occupies..." U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger said publicly at the national conference of the Foreign Policy Association. And, juggling with words, the Pentagon boss strenuously tried to prove the unprovable -- trying with the help of overt slander and juggling of the facts to justify the White House course of fueling the arms race. He used unsubstantiated allegations that "The Russians are concealing their new SS-20 missiles in forests." He called for the Soviet side to put forward "some sort of specific proposals," and so on and so forth. Thus, in an attempt to "explain" why the United States responded to the Soviet moratorium on any nuclear explosions with two underground nuclear explosions in Nevada, Weinberger found nothing better than...to blame this on the USSR.

According to him, the Russians allegedly only made their initiative because they need 6-8 months anyway to prepare for the next tests. While the United States cannot allow itself a "respite" since it allegedly lags hopelessly behind the Soviet Union in terms of the number of nuclear explosions.

There can be no doubt about the absurdity of the "arguments" about a "lag." It can only be really unclear to those who are blinded by anti-Sovietism and who stubbornly refuse to see and hear the obvious. After all even THE NEW YORK TIMES attests that "...at present the United States has carried out 42 percent more nuclear weapon tests than the Soviet Union." "...The United States has tested more nuclear weapons than all other states together" -- that is an extract from a U.S. Energy Department document.

Going on to expound on the supposed impossibility of verifying a total ban on nuclear weapons testing, the Pentagon boss once again blamed everything on the USSR. He said that the Soviet Union's reluctance to promote the organization of reliable monitoring of the cessation such tests is blocking the whole business. For that very reason the present "proposal by the Russians to ban tests is, in my view, impracticable," Weinberger said. However, the real reason lies elsewhere, as a Pentagon official, General R. Saxer, let slip in the heat of revelation: "The program of underground nuclear tests is indispensable for assessing the survivability of our military systems..."

It is "indispensable" because, by 1990, the Pentagon is counting on having acquired at least another 17,000 nuclear charges -- mainly new types and kinds -- in addition to the many tens of thousands of charges it already has. And new types and kinds means those subject to preliminary tests.

Washington's attempt to ascribe its own sins to the "aggressive Russians" can hardly delude the public today. Everybody knows full well that whenever the United States has been ready to negotiate with the USSR on specific questions of limiting the arms race, no difficulties concerning monitoring have arisen and agreements have been concluded. This was the case with the 1963 Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Test in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water, the 1968 Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the ABM Treaty, the Interim Agreement (SALT I) signed in 1972, and the 1979 SALT II Treaty. And whenever the United States has not wanted to negotiate, "arguments" have arisen about supposed insuperable monitoring difficulties.

From the Pentagon boss' viewpoint, "simply insoluble" questions regarding the monitoring of a total ban on nuclear weapons tests have arisen in the current situation too. "In order to ensure comprehensive verification in the majority of specific cases we need on-site verification," the U.S. defense secretary believes. And here he laments: "...in my view, we cannot be sure that even on-site verification will necessarily provide a 100-percent guarantee." Especially if we consider the fact that the Pentagon is prevented from seeing objectively by its anti-Soviet blinders.

CSO: 5200/1050

GENERAL

USSR: COMMENTS ON GORBACHEV ARMS PROPOSALS ON VISIT TO FRANCE

Proposals Summarized

LD061809 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 6 Oct 85

[From the "News and Views" program]

[Text] As you know, Mikhail Gorbachev, the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, paid an official visit to France. Although the visit is over, the Soviet leader's stay in France and his talks and meetings in Paris continue to be the subject of extensive discussion. This is the subject of the talk that now follows:

As far as Soviet-French relations are concerned, it has been noted that the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's talks with Francois Mitterrand justify hopes that the political dialogue between the two countries will become brisker, as will their economic and trade relations. And that is in the interests not just of their peoples, it also serves the cause of international security. For, as history shows, better relations between these two countries have invariably improved the political climate in Europe and hence have stabilized the international situation generally.

There is particular interest, moreover, on a truly international scale, in Mikhail Gorbachev's announcement in Paris concerning the Soviet Union's new steps to halt the diabolical train of the arms race and remove the war menace looming over humanity. What exactly did he have in view?

First, the Soviet Union has offered to reach agreement with the United States on totally banning strike weapons in space and making a truly radical 50 percent cut in nuclear arms that reach the territory of the other side. This would amount to a practical solution of the very problems that were identified by the Soviet Union and the United States at the beginning of the year as the aims of the Geneva talks. Not just stopping the arms race, but drastically scaling down the level of armaments, and at the same time averting an arms race in outer space.

Secondly, Mikhail Gorbachev announced that to facilitate agreement on speedy cuts in intermediate range missiles in Europe the Soviet Union deems it possible to conclude an appropriate agreement separately, apart from the problem of space and strategic arms.

And thirdly, Mikhail Gorbachev referred to the Soviet moratorium on the deployment of intermediate range missiles in Europe. He stated that the number of SS-20 missiles that the USSR now has on operational duty in the European zone is 243. This means it exactly corresponds to the level of June 1984, when the USSR began to deploy additional missiles in reply to the siting of American intermediate missiles in Europe. The additionally deployed SS-20 missiles have now been withdrawn from operational duty and within the next 2 months the stationery installations for these missiles will be dismantled.

This lends itself to verification. The Soviet leader explained that the old and very powerful SS-5 missiles have been completely scrapped and the SS-4 missiles continue to be withdrawn. As a result, the number of intermediate range delivery vehicles in the European zone of the USSR is now much smaller than it was 10 or even 15 years ago.

And Mikhail Gorbachev refuted malicious insinuations that the Soviet Union was planning to transfer these missiles to Asia. He said that in adopting such self-restriction in intermediate range missiles in the European Zone the Soviet Union was guided by the broad interests of European security. I think, he said, that Europe is now entitled to expect a step in reply by the United States, a halt to the deployment of its intermediate range missiles in Europe.

The Soviet leader also emphasized the pressing need for totally banning chemical weapons and abolishing their stockpiles. At the Geneva conference the USSR is taking an active part in framing an appropriate convention. The Soviet Union would be prepared to participate in drawing up an international agreement on the nonproliferation of chemical weapons and it is ready to do everything in its power to establish a chemical-free zone in the center of Europe.

In Paris Mikhail Gorbachev again emphasized that security in Europe, like international security in general, can be achieved only along the lines of peaceful coexistence, a relaxation of tensions, disarmament, confidence-building, and the development of international cooperation.

He drew attention to the importance of first steps on this long and difficult road. For example, he referred to the proposal that a number of states, primarily neutrals had made on exchanging annual plans of military activities subject to notification.

Mikhail Gorbachev said the Soviet Union was prepared to accept such an agreement in the hope that it would help to overcome suspicion and hinder furtive preparations for war.

He also expressed support for the idea of establishing nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, including northern Europe and the Balkans, and a readiness to take part in appropriate guarantees wherever necessary. We regard as useful, he said, the idea of establishing a nuclear-free corridor on the European continent on either side of the line dividing the two military and political alignments. He voiced the conviction that the countries that do not possess nuclear weapons are fully entitled to reliable guarantees of their security in terms of international law, guarantees that nuclear weapons will not be used against them.

In short, the Soviet Union has outlined a sweeping program for defusing the present explosive situation in the world. It is today more important than ever, Mikhail Gorbachev said, to develop a more intensive political dialogue between East and West. The Soviet leader dismissed as absurd, allegations that the USSR by improving relations with Western Europe would like to set Western Europe at loggerheads with the United States. The Soviet Union, he said, would like to have good relations not only with Western Europe but also with the United States, as for that matter with China, Japan and other countries. What the Soviet Union is pursuing is not a policy of a balance of power, of inciting some states against others, but a policy of global relaxation, of consolidating world-wide security and promoting all-round international cooperation.

Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to France has thus again shown how consistently the Soviet Union implements these fundamental principles of foreign policy.

Addressed to Europe, World

LD062327 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Oct 85

[From "The International Panorama Program presented by Stanislav Kondrashov]

[Text] Hello, comrades! There is no doubt that the main event of the past week was the official visit to France by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. That was the main event of last week and, I think, not just of last week alone. In the temporal sense, the significance of the visit, the reverberations of it and its effect on international life go beyond the 4 days spent in Paris, and in the political sense, they even go beyond Soviet-French relations, although the visit did indeed do a lot to develop these. We all followed attentively what went on, in the papers and on television, of course. This spares me, as the "International Panorama" presenter, from the need to retell in detail what is still fresh in our memories. I should like just to share a few thoughts and reflections.

This trip by the Soviet leader was followed with heightened attention from the very start. There were several reasons for this. It was pointed out that this was Comrade Gorbachev's first visit to a Western country since he assumed the office of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Foreign observers were also greatly interested in what they described as the new style of the Soviet leadership and how this style would be manifest in Paris. Furthermore, the Soviet Union and France have always, in spite of occasional skirmishes in relations, valued and guarded relaxation of tension on the European continent. In the final analysis, it was precisely in relations between our two countries that the very concept and practice of relaxation of tension were engendered. Finally, the Soviet leader's visit to France was seen in the West as evidence of the fact that the Soviet Union is placing stronger emphasis than before on the European orientation in its foreign policy.

Well, then, to take the results of the visit, the goal set by both sides at the very start was attained: A new stimulus has indeed been given to Soviet-French relations. As President Mitterrand of France said at the dinner in honor of his Soviet guest: The fact that we belong to different military alliances and different economic and political systems demands mutual respect, frank language and a striving towards dialogue from both sides, so that the spirit of frankness may triumph over lack of understanding. All these conditions, including the triumph of the spirit of frankness which Mitterrand mentioned, were wholly manifest during the visit, as we could see.

The visit, however, did not give a new stimulus to Soviet-French relations alone: It was not just France and the French that the Soviet leader addressed in Paris. Nor just Europe and the Europeans, either. He was addressing the whole world. A powerful impulse was given from Paris to the entire East-West political dialogue, one can say.

What is involved here is not the style, but first and foremost the very essence of Soviet policy. And this was expressed especially forcibly in Comrade Gorbachev's speech to French parliamentarians on Thursday, 3 October. As you know, he announced the content of the new proposals which the Soviet Union presented to the U.S. Government a few days ago and which it has put forward at the Geneva negotiations. The first of these is a proposal to come to terms on totally prohibiting space strike weapons for both sides and making a radical -- really radical, a 50 percent, or one-half -- reduction in the USSR's and United States' nuclear weapons capable of reaching each another's territory. The second proposal concerns medium-range weapons [sredstvo], nuclear medium-range weapons in Europe, which are naturally primarily of concern to Europeans. The Soviet Union considers it possible to conclude an agreement on these weapons separately, outside of any direct link with the problem of space and strategic weapons. Since not only the USSR and United States have medium-range nuclear weapons, but also France and Britain, the Soviet Union expressed readiness for a direct discussion on this topic with the two West European countries. This is a new element, and may I remind you that until now, it has been a Soviet-U.S. discussion.

Then Comrade Gorbachev announced the self-restrictions which our country is introducing in regard to its medium-range missiles in the European zone. We have returned to the number of SS-20 missiles on standby alert which existed in June 1984. The additional missiles deployed since then have been withdrawn from standby alert and it was announced that the stationary installations will be dismantled, within the next 2 months. This was how Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev summarized our proposals. In conjunction with our previous actions, he said, our latest proposals are, it seems to us, a complex of constructive and realistic measures, the realization of which will lead to a genuine turn-around in the development of international relations. This, if you like, is our program for improving the explosive international situation which is threatening peace. We expect the West, too, to do its part in response to our proposals.

This is indeed a whole constructive program. This is how the Soviet proposals are assessed by many foreign observers, who had been awaiting the new Soviet leader's debut in the West, and getting, one might say, more than they expected.

A large part of this Soviet program, which rang forth from Paris, the heart of West Europe, is addressed directly to West Europe, and to West Europeans. In that spirit of frankness which President Mitterrand called for, the Soviet Union is inviting the West European states to a dialogue and all-round mutually beneficial cooperation in security and economic issues, in the spiritual sphere, in the joint struggle against various types of ills, ills of the environment as well as of the human organism.

Finally, to extend even further the meaning of Moscow's call which resounded from Paris, it contains strongly, passionately and convincingly a whole philosophy of international, and intergovernment conduct in the nuclear age. It gives insistent and clear expression to the idea of dragging the backward human consciousness towards a terrible and dangerous existence in a closely interconnected world [as heard]. It contains both a great goal and a lofty dream. This is what Comrade Gorbachev said: Despite all the differences in political and philosophical views, in ideals and values, we must remember one thing -- we are all guardians of the flame of life which has been handed on to us by preceding generations. And further -- and what of our generation? It has made great discoveries, but has found the recipe for self-destruction of the human race. On the threshold of the third millenium, we must burn the black book of nuclear alchemy. May the 21st century be the first century of life without the fear of universal destruction.

U.S. Should 'Think Over' Proposals

LD081659 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1505 GMT 8 Oct 85

[Commentary by TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Chernyshev: "Washington 'Interpreters'" (Tashingtonskiye "Tolkovateli")--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 8 Oct (TASS) -- In the far-reaching peace program presented by M.S. Gorbachev during his visit to France, the progressive public of all countries sees an important foundation for averting nuclear catastrophe, a way toward a real breakthrough in the development of international relations. The USSR's new proposals constitute a whole set [kompleks] of constructive and realistic measures. In each part of this comprehensive set is embedded a profound idea. In particular, the Soviet Union proposed to the United States a complete ban for both sides on space strike weapons and a radical reduction, by 50 percent, on nuclear arms within range of each others' territory. Is this not a way to practical fulfillment of those very tasks which were agreed on at the beginning of the current year by both sides as being the aim of the Geneva talks: not only to halt the nuclear arms race, but also to sharply reduce their level and simultaneously prevent an arms race in outer space. The Soviet Union proposed a simple formula, intelligible to all; a simple, but extremely effective scheme. In it is expressed the essence of the way out of an extremely dangerous situation; for moving the arms race into outer space would make a reduction of nuclear arsenals objectively impossible.

It would seem that all is clear. And indeed, those with a sense of responsibility for the destiny of their people, for the destiny of other peoples, have assessed the Soviet proposals as extremely important and most heartening, as a very promising approach, a significant step forward, designed to give dynamism to the whole process of talks on limitation and reduction of armaments.

However, all this was obviously not to the taste of certain persons in Washington. The opponents of detente from the present U.S. Administration are extremely worried by the effect of the USSR's initiatives on political and public circles and are making attempts to belittle and distort the meaning of these initiatives. They are also occupied by another thought: how to "conceal" from the world public the fact that U.S. work on militarization of outer space is more and more in contravention of existing treaties and agreements.

So they are maneuvering, inventing loopholes in the formulations of the Soviet-U.S. antimissile defense treaty, in order to justify their own actions in developing [sozdaniye] space strike weapons. Meanwhile, the following fact claims one's attention. Until now the allegation that only "research" is being conducted in the United States has been used as a "cover," on the excuse that such research does not hinder the antimissile defense treaty. "Chinks" have thus been inserted in the treaty. Now they are going even further: Efforts are being made to insert the broadest possible "breaches" in it which would affect the very foundation of this major document.

According to the CBS television company, one of the latest administration reports contains the "conclusion" that the antimissile defense treaty, which strictly restricts the development [sozdaniye] of antimissiles, allegedly does not restrict the development [razrabotka] and testing of "exotic" types of weapons -- laser and beam weapons -- at all. It is quite clear which way such "interpreters" are taking the matter. Having just the other day tested land-based laser installations, the United States is now planning to site a laser weapon on board a space-craft and test it directly in space.

It would evidently not be inappropriate to remind some people in Washington yet again that the antimissile defense treaty (Article 5) prohibits both the development [sozdaniye] and testing of space-based antimissile defense systems or components. The treaty provisions relate to any systems designed, as defined in Article 2, for fighting against strategic ballistic missiles or their elements on flight trajectories. Since the antimissile defense components being created within the "star wars" program are designed for precisely this purpose, that is are intended to replace the antimissiles mentioned in the treaty (or to act together with antimissiles), all provisions of the treaty relate to these, regardless of the degree of "exoticness" of their principles of operation. It is high time the irresponsible "interpreters" [tolkovateli] from Washington gave up their useless and dangerous occupation, listened to the voice of the world public, which they are trying to delude, and directed their efforts to positive goals. And they do have something to think over: The set of Soviet initiatives offers broad scope for constructivism.

Washington in 'Confusion'

LD090107 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 8 Oct 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Excerpts] The results of the visit to France remain one of the main themes for the mass information media.

Our proposals do indeed impress; they have obviously thrown Washington administration officials into confusion. Originally, State Department representatives could not make up their minds in general in their assessment of Comrade Gorbachev's statements in Paris. The only thing that has come across perfectly clearly is the fact that the White House is not prepared to reject its "star wars" program. President Reagan has stated this himself; he has added that the United States intends to continue its underground nuclear tests despite the unilateral Soviet moratorium.

Washington officials are currently trying to justify their negative position: either they are putting forward false arguments about the Soviet Union itself carrying out work on its "star wars" program or they are asserting that the Soviet proposals that have been put forward infringe upon the interests of the United States and its West European partners. McFarlane, assistant to the U.S. President for national security affairs, reached the point where he said, apparently, that Soviet proposals are only aimed at achieving a success in the war of words. This is with regard to the appeal to cut down strategic nuclear weapons by half -- some war of words.

It is precisely Washington that is blathering; it appears they are feverishly seeking a pretext to reject our last initiative and continue on their course to militarize space. The White House is counting on achieving military superiority, aided by it.

However, the present U.S. leadership is harboring dangerous illusions. The peaceful proposals being put forward by the Soviet Union are by no means a sign of weakness. We are also ready to go our part of the way in search of a mutually acceptable decision, but we will never allow the United States to break the existing military parity. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has already stated the fact that there will be no agreement on limiting and reducing nuclear arms, if there is no ban on the militarization of space.

The White House still has time to revise its negative position; there are still possibilities to make the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting a constructive and useful one. This depends to a great extent today on whether the Washington administration will be able to reject its unrealizable intentions of achieving military superiority over our country.

U.S., NATO Consultations

LD081805 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT 8 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, October 8 TASS -- U.S. officials in Washington and Geneva are holding a series of conferences and consultations at which they examine the Soviet proposals put forward by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, some of the officials suggest that the differences between the USSR and the U.S. in the approach to the reduction of the number of missiles and bombers which are mentioned in the proposals can be overcome so that the U.S. President and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee could reach agreement at the coming Geneva meeting on further directions of such talks.

Speaking in the White House at a meeting with heads of the "Reagan-Bush" committee, U.S. President Reagan said, among other things, that the U.S. would further seek to cooperate with the Soviet Union for the sake of resolving the existing problems, to work for reaching arms reduction agreement which would be just and verifiable and to lay foundations for a safer life in the present-day world.

The coming Soviet-American summit meeting was also in the centre of attention of a conference between President Reagan and the NATO Secretary General Carrington. According to a representative of the President, Reagan stressed his striving for the meeting to be "constructive".

Carrington said at a press conference held at the Department of State that NATO displayed considerable interest in the aspect of the Geneva meeting dealing with arms control. He described as favourable the fact that the Soviet Union had put forward its new proposals on arms limitation. According to Carrington, for a long time the Soviet Union has not come up with concrete proposals which, besides, would be as detailed as these ones. This fact should be welcomed, he said. In his opinion, the latest Soviet initiative is not necessarily aimed at splitting NATO, as some people in the West say.

At the same time, it has been reported that the U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle held a conference in Brussels which analyzed a joint stand of the NATO member states concerning the approach to the Soviet initiatives. In an interview after the conference Perle asserted, contrary to real facts, that there was no urgent call for changing the U.S. stand at the Geneva talks in connection with the Soviet proposals to reduce by half the nuclear weapons that could reach the Soviet and American territories. At the same time Perle had to admit that some representatives of the European members of NATO said that it would be a mistake to turn down the Soviet proposals as not requiring examination.

The assistant secretary of defense said that those circles had expressed concern over the fact that the absence of attractive counter-proposals coming from the U.S. could revive the charges that the U.S. did not approach seriously the problem of arms control.

The press also quotes a statement of the spokesman of the White House Spokes who, answering the question on what the U.S. was going to do in response to the Soviet proposal said that the U.S. kept it a secret all that it was doing in Geneva, that the U.S. certainly wished to continue the discussion there after the proposal was put on the table, that the American side would analyze it and would start discussing it with the Soviet side. He publicly came up with some criticism of the Soviet proposal, he said. According to Spokes, the criticism was well-founded. The White House spokesman stressed that there were no changes in Reagan's stand with regard to the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

IZVESTIYA Editorial

PM081336 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Oct 85 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "A Time for Decisions"]

[Text] The leaves of the calendar tumble disquietingly, bundling our multifaceted and contradictory world inexorable toward the end of the 20th century. Now that we have penetrated the depths of the atomic nucleus and the remote expanses of the galaxy, now that scientific achievements are being used too often and too vigorously to create means of mass extermination and now that the destruction of the world, while morally inconceivable, have become a technical possibility, Hamlet's question "to be or not to be" is no longer being posed to individuals, but to the entire human race.

To be or not to be? There can only be one answer to this ultimate question -- mankind and civilization must survive. But this can only be achieved by learning to live together, getting along with one another in this small world, and considering one another's interests; that is; learning what is called the policy of peaceful coexistence.

The policy of peaceful coexistence, formulated by the founder of our state, the great Lenin, is part and parcel of our philosophy, of our social system, and of the Soviet land's inner needs. So it was, so it is, and so it always will be. Our chief aim today is to accelerate the social and economic development of society and achieve a qualitatively new form of society. Reliable peace and a tranquil and normal international situation are very important conditions for the implementation of this grand task.

This applies above all to the problem of disarmament and how to curb the arms race, which is pushing the world toward a nuclear missile catastrophe. In his speech at the meeting with French parliamentarians, which met with unanimous support among the Soviet people and broad circles of the international public, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev specially emphasized how important it is to stop the "infernal train" of the arms race immediately.

The USSR is not just making appeals. Our initiatives in this sphere are well-known. The other day the Soviet Union took new steps pursuing this noble goal. First, we made a proposal to the United States on reaching an agreement on completely banning space strike weapons for both sides and radically reducing, by 50 percent, nuclear weapons capable of reaching one another's territory. Second, in order to facilitate an accord on the swiftest possible mutual reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, we saw the possibility of concluding a corresponding agreement separately, without any direct link with the problem of space and strategic armaments. In view of the growth of the French and British nuclear potentials in the European balance of forces we believe that the time has come to start talking directly with them on this topic and to try to find an acceptable solution through joint efforts. Third, we have already announced a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. The number of SS-20 missiles which the Soviet Union has in service [na boyevom dezhurstve] in the European zone corresponds exactly to the level in June 1984 when the additional deployment of our missiles began in response to the installation of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. The additional SS-20 missiles have now been taken out of service and the fixed installations for the deployment of these missiles will be dismantled in the next 2 months. This can be verified. However, our counter-measures relating to the territory of the United States remain in force. It should be added that we have already taken all the old and very powerful SS-5 missiles out of service and are continuing to remove SS-4 missiles. This means that overall there are considerably fewer medium-range delivery vehicles in the European zone than 10 or even 15 years ago.

When we impose these limits on ourselves we are guided by the broad interests of European security.

These are the kind of serious steps the Soviet Union is taking.

Our new proposals have been placed on the table of the Geneva negotiations. Will the West go its part of the way? This is by no means an idle question. Imperialist circles, above all the U.S. military-industrial complex, are still steering a course toward supercharging the arms race and transferring it to space. The cock-and-bull stories about the purpose of "star wars" being to safeguard world peace have no bearing on reality. It is not merely an illusion, it is a very dangerous illusion. If the initiators of "star wars" insist on prising ahead on their dangerous path the world, which is in a very complex state as it is, will be in for even bleaker times. Mankind needs "star peace," not "star wars."

The USSR's new steps aimed at curbing the baleful arms race were first announced to the world by France's high-ranking Soviet visitor in the Elysee Palace in Paris, in the very heart of Western Europe, so to speak. It is both symbolic and natural. There is a very strong feeling in Europe that peoples' fates are interrelated and interwoven despite the different social and historical paths they have chosen. On the other hand, because of geographical density and saturation with armaments, Europe is more vulnerable than any other continent to armed conflict, specially nuclear missile conflict.

European security, genuine European security cannot be safeguarded by military means. The complete new situation that has taken shape on the continent urgently dictates a break with the traditions, way of thinking, and way of acting that were formed over centuries and even millennia. Human thought does not adapt to anything new immediately. But the process is inevitable. As M.S. Gorbachev stressed, we have begun a reappraisal, making many customary phenomena, including those in the military and, of course, political spheres, accord fully with the new realities. We would like to see the same reappraisal take place in Western Europe and beyond.

Europe's experience. Europe's destiny... Europe was the epicenter of both world wars. But it also brought forth the idea of detente, with the Soviet Union and France among its initiators in the seventies, and it was in Europe that the idea of collective security was born. Europe's experience. Europe's destiny... There is the Europe of Munich and the Europe of Helsinki, the Europe of Metternich's policy of setting some states against others, knocking together blocs and counterblochs, creating all manner of "axes" and "triangles," and the Europe of peaceful cooperation, good-neighborliness, and trust. Unfortunately, the first Europe is today's reality, and the second is the future prospect. It is necessary to change this dangerous reality and bring the fruitful prospect nearer.

We are all guardians of the flame of life passed on by previous generations. They performed their duty to their descendants. Now it is our turn. This is the lofty historical and philosophical and, at the same time, realistic and practical standpoint from which we approach the solution of Hamlet's "to be or not to be" question in relation to the destiny of our planet. This question cannot be solved without a psychological readjustment and without political will.

Both M.S. Gorbachev's official visit to France and the preparations for the summit meeting in Geneva demonstrate the supreme degree of responsibility our country is displaying in the international arena with regard to future generations and the destiny of human civilization.

The time for decisions is knocking insistently at the door.

PRAVDA Weekly Review

PM081644 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[Boris Orekhov "International Review"]

[Excerpts] Great Step Toward Disarmament

The official visit to France by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which has been the number one event in today's international life, is over.

It can be said with no fear of exaggeration that our planet's peoples have never had such a desire for peace and a desire to stop the arms race -- primarily the nuclear arms race -- to avert the threat of war, and to secure a turn away from confrontation and toward peaceful cooperation and detente as they do now. Recently, however, history has not spoiled us with events capable of inspiring human hearts with serious hope that mankind will be able to look to the future with confidence. Today that hope has appeared. This is attested by the numerous foreign responses to the results of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France, his speeches during the visit, the new Soviet initiatives he set forth, and the optimism which imbued the speeches of the Soviet leader, who called on mankind, on the threshold of the third millennium, to burn the black book of nuclear "alchemy" and make the next century the first century of life without fear of universal death.

The Soviet Union has again demonstrated that it does not restrict itself to peace appeals and declarations and that the foreign policy initiatives it has advanced are specific, practical, tangible, and imbued with a sincere desire to mark a breakthrough in international development and channel it along the course of peaceful cooperation and detente. That is how the Soviet initiatives made public during the visit -- particularly the proposal to the U.S. Government that agreement be reached on totally banning space strike arms for both sides and on halving nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territories -- have been assessed everywhere.

Foreign observers are noting that this proposal contains a practical resolution of the very tasks which were agreed by both sides at the start of the year as the goals of the Geneva talks: not only to end the arms race, but to sharply reduce the level of arms and simultaneously prevent an arms race in space. The Soviet Union's expressed readiness to conclude a separate agreement on medium-range nuclear means in Europe was also highly assessed, as was the USSR's decision to unilaterally reduce the number of SS-20 missiles in the European zone.

"I am convinced," J. Mortimer, one of the leading figures in the British Labor Party, said, "that the new Soviet proposals are extremely timely, important, and very necessary steps."

But what's new in Washington? There, it seems, they are "on the defensive." From what? From the Soviet peace offensive. That is how foreign mass media organs sarcastically describe the stance taken by the White House toward the new Soviet initiatives.

Striving to belittle the importance of our steps, particularly of the proposal to halve the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territories, Washington hastened to label it a "counterproposal" and state that it is "too general in nature." Of course, all this looks simply frivolous and flimsy.

As U.S. observers are noting, the fact is that the Washington administration has now fallen into its own propaganda trap: The U.S. President made serious dialogue on the issues of limiting the arms race conditional on Moscow's assent to carrying out significant reductions in nuclear arsenals, claiming that the ball here is exclusively in the USSR's court. But, now that everyone has seen that a concrete step has been taken in this direction, the President is in a difficult position: People expect him to react adequately to the Soviet initiative. But, as is obvious, the White House in no way wants to do this, since such a response does not fit into the framework of the policy being pursued by the current U.S. leaders. This has been the case before too: As soon as it comes to specific actions, the administration, in the form of all its representatives of various ranks, turns "hard about" like a flotilla.

An accurate assessment of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Paris was provided by Japan's ASAHI newspaper, which called the visit and its results a "step toward the relaxation of tension." That is indeed so. It can only be added that it is not just a step, but a great step which, in the opinion of Britain's DAILY EXPRESS, "will have a far-reaching influence on East-West relations."

The need for more active collaboration among states, governments, and political leaders is felt perhaps more than ever in our alarming times. The example of the Soviet Union and France testifies that such collaboration is possible since our two countries, despite belonging to opposing military-political groupings, have much in common in their approach to the resolution of a number of acute problems and situations existing in the world. The Paris meetings and talks were vivid confirmation of that.

During the visit it was noted that the political climate in Europe depends to a considerable extent on how East-West economic ties develop. In Paris, the Soviet side expressed a readiness to seek new forms of cooperation and collaboration in this area and to establish, for instance, more businesslike relations between the CEMA and the EEC. This is also very important; many countries are interested in it.

The press in the socialist countries is calling the visit an event of paramount importance. Its results, Czechoslovak newspapers are noting, for instance, may influence to a decisive extent both the further development of cooperation and mutual understanding between the USSR and France and the reduction of international tension on a European and world scale.

That is what people on all continents are hoping today.

LD091659 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 9 Oct 85

["McFarlane Looks for 'Gaps'"--TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, October 9 TASS -- The Soviet proposals on a radical reduction of nuclear arms and non-militarisation of outer space have become the centre of discussion by politicians and public figures in the United States, and also the mass media. Here in the United States they cannot conceal the fact that the Soviet leadership has come up with a bold initiative with the aim of improving the international situation and setting right East-West relations, including along the European direction. Observers note that the large-scale proposals made by Mikhail Gorbachev during his visit to France open up broad possibilities for a constructive political dialogue at the forthcoming summit meeting in Geneva.

In a number of his public appearances the President of the United States had to note that the United States treated these proposals with attention and was studying them. But there are also other obvious trends as well. The representatives of the military-industrial complex and also those who reflect its views in the administration are trying hard to belittle the importance of these proposals in every way and even to distort their essence. Attempts are being made ever more frequently on the part of the administration to question and even to discredit the Soviet proposals on nuclear and space arms. Since it is impossible to do this without contradicting common sense the representatives of the administration are compelled to manipulate facts and distort the real state of affairs. The appearance of the Presidential adviser for national security affairs Robert McFarlane in the NBC "Meet the Press" television programme is indicative in this respect.

From the outset he tried to present the new Soviet proposals as supposedly being unfair to the United States and not providing a basis for future agreements. Shifting and dodging, he tried to present matters in such a way as though the real purpose behind these proposals is the Soviet Union's desire to make the United States give up its so called "Strategic Defence Initiative" while at the same time continuing its own similar programme. Even correspondents taking part in the interview noted the groundlessness of such arguments. They pointed out quite logically that if the Soviet Union, as the administration contends, really has a similar programme would it not be best in these circumstances for the United States to accept as quickly as possible the Soviet proposals to ban any deployment of arms in outer space instead of trying by all means to push through its "star wars" programme.

Instead of giving a straight answer McFarlane rudely distorted the essence of the 1972 Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of ABM systems. In particular, he contended that the provisions of this treaty permit tests and development in the field of new types of weapons in outer space. This is not true: Article 5 of the treaty prohibits each of the sides to develop, test and deploy sea-, air-, or mobile-ground based ABM systems or components. In the opinion of prominent American specialists, including those who took a direct part in the drafting of that treaty, in particular Gerard Smith, in his intent to "substantiate the legality" of the experiments planned by the administration within the framework of the SDI McFarlane has exceeded all limits.

As pointed out by the press, McFarlane's contention that the ABM treaty supposedly sanctions the testing of any ABM systems can be accepted as an argument only by those who hear about the existence of such a treaty for the first time and not at all by those who signed it and are familiar with its content.

It follows from McFarlane's further statements that according to the American interpretation the Soviet proposal to cut by 50 per cent the nuclear arms capable of reaching the territory of the United States and the USSR supposedly does not provide for reducing such arms by a half. He tried to present matters in such a way as if such American arms as the Pershing-2 missiles and cruise missiles, including sea-launched ones, that are deployed in direct proximity of the USSR, and also the carrier borne nuclear weapon systems do not give the United States a strategic advantage and for this reason supposedly should be taken out of the strategic equation.

In other words, the United States would like to withdraw these weapons from the overall strategic balance and thereby secure for itself an advantage both in the European theatre and in forward-based systems. McFarlane also presented in a negative light the Soviet decision to reduce the number of SS-20 missiles in the European zone and expressed dissatisfaction that the Soviet Union is retaining a certain number of these missiles as a counterbalance to the NATO nuclear forces in Europe, including the United States forward-based weapon systems. The assistant to the President contended that these missiles supposedly confront the United States with a choice between its own defence and the defence of its allies. The absurdity of these allegations is obvious: The Soviet Union proposes to leave in the European part as many of its missiles as the NATO countries have (counting by warhead) and not one missile more.

The American Pershings and cruise missiles are unlawfully deployed on European territory with the aim of creating a threat directly to the territory of the Soviet Union. They have nothing to do with the defence of the U.S. allies, and are an offensive, strategic weapon in respect of the Soviet Union. At the same time it is absolutely clear to all, including to Americans, that the Soviet SS-20 missiles do not threaten the territory of the United States. All that McFarlane has said on this matter is a flagrant distortion of the actual state of affairs.

After McFarlane made his lengthy statement journalists asked him the question: Does it follow from his explanation that the United States would like to retain first-strike arms. To this McFarlane said that in any event it would be much better for the United States President to have systems capable of striking at Soviet military targets. The newsmen directly asked him why the United States Administration was now looking only for "gaps" in the Soviet proposals although the latter has met halfway the United States which, as it claims, is long pressing for a radical reduction of nuclear arms. Trying to extricate himself out of this situation the presidential assistant said that the Soviet proposals do contain elements that can be viewed as constructive, that he did not want to create the impression of a negative attitude to the ongoing process and that the President himself supposedly is trying to extract the maximum possible out of this process.

The American press views McFarlane's remarks as evidence that a certain part of the American Administration, while not opposing directly the Soviet proposals as a whole, is trying, in the view of observers, to break them up into pieces and subject them to unconstructive criticism. It is especially alarming that McFarlane, in effect, has attacked the Soviet proposal on the 50 per cent reduction of the arsenals of both sides which together with the proposal on the non-militarisation of outer space is the key issue called upon to put an end to the dangerous arms race and protect the world from the dangerous sliding down to nuclear confrontation.

GENERAL

TASS ON FOREIGN MEDIA REACTION TO GORBACHEV FRENCH TV INTERVIEW

PH040913 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS roundup: "In the Interests of All Mankind"]

[Excerpt] 2 Oct--The official visit to France by M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and his statement for French television are at the center of attention of the world public and press. Prominent political and public figures in various countries and the foreign press are noting that in resolving the colossal tasks of developing the economy, social relations, and democracy, the Soviet Union is interested in peace and a stable international situation and resolutely opposes the arms race. Extensively publicizing and commenting on the Soviet leader's statement, the mass media emphasize that the Soviet Union is not only calling for a halt to the dangerous process of material preparation for war but is also working actively in this direction, time and again demonstrating its good will, a constructive approach to the solution of the most important problems, and a resolve to preserve and consolidate peace.

M. S. Gorbachev's visit to France and his statement for French television are generating tremendous interest in France. Publishing a detailed account of his speech, L'HUMANITE stresses that the Soviet Union considers the approaching Soviet-French summit to be important. M. S. Gorbachev pointed out that the development of cooperation between France and the USSR meets both peoples' vital interests. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee condemned the colossal new arms programs and very dangerous strategic concepts now being formulated. The Soviet Union resolutely opposes the arms race on earth and resolutely opposes its extension into space. It is necessary to stop this dangerous process and work for disarmament without delay. At the present time, when international tension is causing concern and the arms race could become even more dangerous in character, this visit provides an opportunity to prevent a further growth in the threat hanging over the world.

The Soviet leader, LIBERATION notes, pointed to the need to renew the detente process and called for an improvement in the climate in Europe. The dynamism of the course pursued by the Soviet leadership, the newspaper writes, is clearly causing confusion in the West. Certain Western politicians have still not managed to respond to the Soviet leadership's surprisingly energetic foreign policy course. LES ECHOS publishes materials devoted to problems of Soviet-French economic cooperation.

M. S. Gorbachev's statement for French television has aroused great interest in the United States. ABC-TV reports: This week will occupy an important place in the history of East-West relations. The Soviet leader warns that the work being done in the United States to create an ABM system within the framework of the "star wars" program considerably complicates the nuclear and space arms talks in Geneva as well as the approaching summit meeting with President Reagan. He stressed that the threat of a nuclear missile catastrophe is a bitter truth and called on the U.S. President to make the upcoming meeting more than one of just getting to know each other. He advocated a change of attitude in international relations. M. S. Gorbachev's television interview was a perfect exposition of the Soviet stance.

CBS-TV reports: In his interview, which was marked by firmness and clarity, the Soviet leader emphasized Moscow's serious attitude to the approaching meeting in Geneva and urged President Reagan to prepare thoroughly for this meeting. "During the interview in Moscow M. S. Gorbachev made it clear that the Soviet Union's opposition to the U.S. 'Star Wars' program remains unshakable," NBC-TV states. The WASHINGTON POST notes that in his television interview M. S. Gorbachev made it clear that he wants the summit in Geneva to produce more than just handshakes and pleasant smiles for the television cameras. Moscow, THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, is trying to have the "Star Wars" program halted by indicating the grave consequences which this program could have for such agreements in the arms control sphere as the 1972 ABM Limitation Treaty.

Britain's DAILY TELEGRAPH characterizes the Soviet leader's visit as an important political event. As expected, disarmament and European security will predominate at the Soviet leader's meetings with President Mitterrand, particularly in view of the USSR's latest peace initiatives.

"M. S. Gorbachev addresses French television viewers in a cordial tone. The discussion was conducted in a natural, calm, and pleasant manner," Italy's Il MESSAGGERO writes. "The Soviet leader openly stated that the approaching meeting in Geneva must be thoroughly prepared so that the world of the future is built with good bricks."

Moscow is convinced that, in view of the deterioration of the international situation, the struggle for peace and the relaxation of tension is an urgent task, and it stresses that every responsible government and politician must adopt a clear stance on these questions. Japan's KYODO NEWS SERVICE points out. The Soviet Union sharply criticizes the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" program and resolutely opposes the militarization of space.

CSO: 5200/1052

GENERAL

USSR'S ZAGLADIN CRITIQUES FRENCH ARMS POLICIES

PM041041 Paris LE MONDE in French 3 Oct 85 p 2

[Article by Vadim Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section: "Moving Toward a More Mature Detente"]

[Text] Joint actions by the USSR and France can now have more influence than ever. The strengthening of these actions is likely to play a major role in improving the international situation and, hence, in creating better conditions for the development of each of our two countries. What do we mean by this?

The world and mankind are weary of confrontation and the exhausting arms race. People are therefore talking increasingly frequently of the era of detente and expressing a desire to return to it. The Soviet Union obviously wants detente. However, the word "return" does not seem entirely accurate, because we are determined to move forward and not to retrace our steps. Moving forward means moving toward a new, deeper detente and, to cite the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, a more mature detente. We also know that the French leaders have frequently spoken out against confrontation and for the normalization of East-West relations. It is therefore a sphere to which our two governments and our two foreign ministries can jointly devote their efforts. This relates more especially to the Helsinki process, a European process which our two countries helped initiate. It seems that the Stockholm conference started a forward movement. Nobody doubts that this movement could be accelerated by our two countries' joint efforts (which, of course, would not be the only ones to make them in this case).

The cessation of the arms race and the maximum reduction of the arms ceilings are the essential precondition and the premise for this new detente. It is also an area which seems very favorable for joint actions by our two countries. However, I will not conceal the fact that I find that the efforts made by France in the military sphere do not necessarily pursue this objective.

Does this mean that interaction is impossible? In my view it certainly does not. A frank and trusting dialogue, and an active search for points on which agreement is possible, can enable us to achieve progress in this sphere too.

What has just been said applies in particular to the nonmilitarization of space. Paris has several times advocated such a solution. This is also a sphere of action in which our two countries could act separately or together. The conditions for that exist.

The world is a prey to regional conflicts. However, France and the USSR interpret their origins in a different way. But, despite these initial differences, it is possible, and experience confirms this, to make joint or parallel efforts to solve these crises which endanger peace. That would benefit our two countries and the whole world.

Other spheres exist in which more active cooperation would be bound to benefit our two countries. These are, in particular, culture and science, technology, the humanitarian sphere, and, finally, the economic sphere.

The last question deserves a little more attention. In fact our economic structures are complementary. Does this mean that all the possible conclusions have already been drawn? I am sure that it does not. The scale of our cooperation -- both with regard to French exports to the USSR and Soviet exports to France and with regard to cooperation in industry, science, and technology, is still well below our potential. Why is this the case? It so happens that this can be attributed to a whole series of factors, some of which, for instance various prohibitions and restrictions, do not depend on our countries since neither of them is responsible for them. However, other factors are, in some way, of national origin.

Respecting Opinions

We Soviets are convinced that showing wisdom today means respecting everybody's customs and opinions and not extending ideological disagreements to the sphere of interstate relations. In other words this means that it is necessary to respect each country's sovereignty and individuality, and never to use these disagreements to stir up ideological tension, or to sow distrust, whatever our attitudes toward the policies we are implementing and the political assessments we make of our reciprocal actions. There must be neither "believers" nor "heretics." It is by actions that you prove you are right, not by making accusations or hurling abuse at your opponent.

I have the impression that the French media have a major role to play in this connection, especially as serious and influential a newspaper as LE MONDE. I am convinced that my colleagues on that newspaper are far from having exhausted all the opportunities for informing their readers more fully and more effectively about the Soviet situation, however without concealing their viewpoints and without using these opportunities as a pretext for hostile attacks on my country. I would like to recall this in particular on the occasion of the Soviet-French summit.

Time is passing and requires us to move forward. The nuclear threat is a sword of Damocles which must be removed. The turn of events depends to a large extent on our countries. I would like to hope that the contribution made by France and the USSR to improving the international situation will be more serious and tangible from month to month and from day to day. The USSR is prepared to do this. It is in this spirit that we in Moscow view the Gorbachev-Mitterrand summit.

GENERAL

MOSCOW HITS U.S. STAND ON SOVIET INITIATIVES

PM171341 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Sep 85 First Edition p 1

[Mikhail Ozerov "International Review": "To Get Out of the Impasse"]

[Text] Yes, precisely this is today's task. An extremely important, vitally necessary task. For it is possible to ensure a turn toward peaceful development and halt the slide toward the nuclear abyss only by getting out of the impasse in which the process of limiting arms and Soviet-American relations now find themselves.

You think of this on familiarizing yourself with the commentaries on M. S. Gorbachev's replies to TIME magazine and on his statements during recent meetings with foreign delegations. The number of responses coming in from different parts of the world is growing every day. More and more new articles in newspapers and magazines. Items on radio and television....

What, then, has aroused such tremendous interest?

The responses themselves answer this question. For example, a statement by the board of the West German Social Democratic Party of Germany points out that the answers "contain a tremendous reserve of constructiveness." This same word is used by many journalists, diplomats, statesmen, and public figures. Again and again they draw attention to the genuine constructiveness and principledness of Soviet foreign policy.

Our party and people show the world the determination to achieve a sharp turn toward improving the situation and changing conditions not only in the Soviet state but also in the international arena. Strictly speaking, one link is an inseparable continuation of another: For we need only peaceful conditions to successfully pursue the planned course of developing the country and increasingly widely satisfying the people's needs and aspirations.

Our determination is manifested clearly, definitely, and with a great degree of responsibility. And it is manifested in specific deeds, in deeds of tremendous significance. Precisely this is how our recent foreign policy initiatives have been regarded abroad. The moratorium introduced by the

Soviet Union on nuclear explosions, the proposal that the United States subscribe to it and resume talks on a total ban on nuclear tests.... The proposals for peaceful cooperation and the prevention of an arms race in space....

The purpose of these initiatives is quite specific—to break the vicious circle and find a way out of the present complex situation.

Unfortunately, however, it is not yet possible to break the vicious circle. It is not possible even though Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms are being held in Geneva and there is an accord on the summit meeting. What is more: The threat of war is increasing. A danger has also appeared that the arms race will reach a qualitatively new stage.

It is extremely difficult to halt these exceedingly alarming processes. Difficult but possible. The good will of all the interested parties is needed. This is why such a broad response was elicited by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's words: "The chief question which we must answer for ourselves is: Are we ready, finally, to admit that there is no other way than to live at peace with one another, and are we ready to reorganize our way of thinking and acting from a military to a peaceful way? As you say—live and let live. We call this peaceful coexistence. As for the Soviet Union, we reply to this question in the affirmative."

Our peace efforts are virtually being sabotaged on the other side of the ocean. We announce a moratorium on nuclear explosions, and the United States at once responds with a new nuclear explosion. The Soviet Union submits a proposal on peaceful cooperation in space and adopts unilateral pledges not to test antisatellite systems, while they intend to conduct today combat tests of an antisatellite weapon--the ASAT system--and simultaneously begin new tests of the MX strategic missile.... We call for the strengthening of confidence, and in reply Washington raises a ballyhoo about "red propaganda..."

The approach to the upcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva is also significant. One side is ready for a concrete businesslike discussion and wants to reach accords. But the other craves one thing—to secure more concessions from the Soviet Union, concessions in everything, including even our country's exclusively internal affairs. These days Washington states this openly and arrogantly. And it is not secondary officials who say this, but high-ranking statesmen right up to the vice president and even the president! Their recent speeches, including R. Reagan's interview on the network of U.S. college radio stations, are a kind of "cocktail" of abuse, fabrications, and threats.

The banks of the Potomac are clearly being swamped by a new wave of hostility toward our country. And yet the old waves have not died down either. The administration there still shows no desire to remove the serious obstacle which could become the chief stumbling block during the summit meeting. And it erected this obstacle itself at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. It is a question of their plans for "star wars." Our country's viewpoint is well known:

It is possible to ensure mutual security only by reaching an accord on the nonmilitarization of space in conjunction with the reduction of nuclear arms. However, the American leaders stubbornly cover their ears when Soviet representatives speak about this.

Geneva cannot and must not become an arena for a clash between something like political "supergladiators," who will think only about how to score more "points" in this clash. The cause of peace must benefit as a result of the meeting. This is precisely what people await from the meeting, as responses and commentaries show.

Bellicose outbursts and the language of force are inappropriate between our countries--this is one of the leitmotifs of M. S. Gorbachev's statements, which elicited great attention abroad. "The Soviet side," American Senator Paul Sarbanes declared, "demands to be treated on equal terms and comes out resolutely in favor of switching USSR-U.S. relations to a constructive track taking the partners' mutual interests into account."

The opinion of another American--Adam Ulan, eminent scientist and professor at Harvard University--is also significant. During a meeting of our newspaper's editorial office he said:

"U.S. citizens hope that the Geneva meeting will lead to positive results. That is, results which will improve both the relations between our countries and the situation throughout the world. The American people feel great respect for Soviet people and would like to strengthen ties with them in various directions."

And what do Soviet people think? Their opinion is expressed in letters which are now flooding into newspapers, magazines, and television.... I read those which come to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. They are vivid, full of emotion, and, as the saying goes, written from the heart. And imbued with pride in our country: Their writers warmly approve the party's policy and hail the Soviet Union's peace steps.

But when they start writing about the United States, you read angry lines. "I am indignant at the actions of the American leadership, which refuses to reduce arms and is creating weapons for waging 'star wars.' And after this it still holds forth about democracy, human rights, and some notorious 'terrorism' allegedly being perpetrated on Moscow's orders! How much falsehood and cynicism there is here!"

The opinion of V. Ivanov--a Patriotic War invalid from the village of Nikolaskoye in Voronezh Oblast--is shared by other readers of our newspaper. At the same time many of them hope that a realistic approach will still prevail in Washington and that the American Administration will take practical steps to normalize relations with the USSR.

And one other thing unites the letter writers. Confidence in our country's strength. "I am 76 years old," Muscovite S. Mironenkov writes. "How many times before my eyes have people tried to frighten us, break us, and even bring us to our knees! But not one attempt has succeeded. Has Washington really not understood this yet? We will allow no one to dictate his will to us. But we have always moved and are ready to move toward cooperation and good relations."

The writers believe in changes for the better. They believe that their life and the life of their children will be happy and peaceful.

...Now the planet waits. It waits and hopes. All sober-minded people hail the course which our country is boldly, confidently, and dynamically taking. Implementing great plans for its socioeconomic development, it is full of determination to ensure peace, to break the vicious circle of the arms race, and to normalize relations with the Soviet Union [as published]. In general, to get out of the impasse in which, thanks to Washington, the planet finds itself.

CSO: 5200/1042

GENERAL

TASS HITS CONSERVATIVE SENATORS' LETTER ON ARMS CONTROL

LD091904 Moscow TASS in English 1818 GMT 9 Oct 85

["Senators Intimidating the President"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, October 9 TASS — TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

On the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting, nuclear war lobbyists in all echelons of executive and legislative power of the United States have launched a frenzied campaign aimed at preventing the very possibility of reaching new agreements to curb the arms race and at frustrating the agreements now in effect.

Eight American Republican senators, notorious for their vision of the world "through the notch of the gun sight", who are apparently concerned over the positive reaction of the world public to the fresh Soviet peace initiatives, have addressed an open letter to President Reagan, assuring the U.S. President that allegedly under the present day conditions "the existing arms control treaties and negotiating process only undermine the security of America and the Free World". To substantiate their conclusions on ways to "ensure the security of the United States," Senators Jesse Helms, Steve Symms, Chic Hecht, Malcolm Wallop, Jake Garn, Paul Laxalt, Strom Thurmond and Jeremiah Denton found no better arguments than the hackneyed "facts" cooked up by the Pentagon about the alleged violation by the Soviet Union of the provisions of the SALT-1 Treaty and of the SALT-2 Treaty which, for that matter, the United States has not ratified to this day.

Judging by the letter, the senators are extremely concerned over the recent promise by the U.S. President in public to "go the extra mile" in search of a peaceful resolution of the problems confronting mankind. They advise Reagan to give up that promise, and describe such efforts as "futile".

The senators do not stint dark paint in order to intimidate their own president and make him exclude in advance the possibility of reaching any agreements with the Soviet Union on lessening the danger of a nuclear catastrophe. The eight legislators described, in particular, the Soviet proposals aimed at preventing the arms race on outer space and ending it on earth as "extremely dangerous nuclear blackmail threats", claiming that their acceptance by the United States "may provoke a military, even nuclear crisis".

Thurmond, Laxalt and their colleagues do not conceal what measures "to restore American moral authority" they expect from the President in the near future. Among them refusal to disassemble the "Poseidon" submarines in violation of the provisions of the SALT-2

Treaty, reassessment of the "entire spectrum of U.S.-Soviet relations", certainly, not toward improving them, continuation of the unbridled campaign of "Soviet military threat" allegations, an intensive deployment of the U.S. "MX" ICBMs, "accelerating and adding to the U.S. strategic modernisation programme."

The letter explicitly urges the president not to strive to win the laurels of a peace-maker in an attempt at ensuring a lowering of the level of military confrontation, but rather make efforts to come into history from the "positions of strength".

The letter from the eight senators to the President is evidence that the upcoming Geneva summit meeting, the Soviet Union's peace initiatives have increased the polarisation between the supporters of normalising international relations and advocates of confrontation in the United States, the latter already going beyond the limits of common sense.

CSO: 5200/1042

GENERAL

MOSCOW WEEKLY ROUNDTABLE ON NEW SOVIET PROPOSALS

LDO62302 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 6 Oct 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Boris Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator; Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, editorial board member of Novoye Vremya, Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer for KOMMUNIST]

Soviet Arms Proposals

[Excerpt][Andrianov]Hello comrades! The week that is ending has been marked by an event of enormous political importance. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, was on an official visit to France at the invitation of President Francois Mitterrand of the French Republic. The great importance of that trip was determined by the desire to reduce international tension and remove the threat of war that is hanging over mankind. For we live in a troubled age, and it strongly demands from statesmen clarity of political thought, responsibility, a definite set of priorities, courage, dynamism, purposefulness, and initiative. It is these very qualities that are demonstrated by the leadership of our country in the understanding that there is now no more urgent task than the struggle to strengthen peace on the planet earth and they are making more and more resolute efforts in that struggle.

Fresh evidence of this was the Soviet-French summit dialogue. Its results are of importance not only for relations between the Soviet Union and France; Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meeting with Francois Mitterrand will give an important positive impetus to the development of the situation in Europe and, of course, throughout the world.

[Nekrasov] The question of the very existence of life on earth is now facing peoples with greater acuteness than ever before, and it is first and foremost over Europe that the darkest cloud of nuclear death now hangs. Meanwhile, that continent, like no other because of its geographical density and oversaturation with weapons, particularly vulnerable to armed conflict, especially a nuclear one. This fact insistently dictates the need for all Europeans at such a menacing time to take a stance of categorical resistance to war with all of its terrible consequences. All mankind is in fact faced with a choice: Either to continue the suicidal course toward a further buildup of the arms race which leads to increasingly risky balancing on the edge of a nuclear catastrophe or travel the path of serious, responsible talks aimed at establishing interstate relations of mutually advantageous cooperation which guarantees reliable security for all. It is appropriate to note that it is just such relations, based on a desire for cooperation, between the Soviet Union and France -- two states with different social systems -- that for many years have to a considerable degree been promoting the preservation of peace and stability in Europe and the whole world.

[Andrianov] Addressing French parliamentarians, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed how important it is right now to stop immediately, before it is too late, the infernal train of the arms race, to start reducing arms, to improve the international situation and develop peaceful cooperation between peoples. This, the Soviet leader noted, is in our mutual interests. It is a universal task: No one can allow themselves to sit idly by. It is today that such measures must be taken, because tomorrow it will become more difficult to try to reach agreement on them unless the trends in operation today which preserve and strengthen international tension are stopped. As far as our country's concerned, it is acting vigorously to halt the arms race and prevent a further growth of the threat that hangs over the world. As you know, the Soviet Union has unilaterally cut short the further stationing of medium-range missiles in Europe and has called on the United States to respond in the same way.

Our country has also unilaterally halted all nuclear explosions and has called on Washington to follow that example. The Soviet initiative on the reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe is well-known. We come out strongly in favor of space being used exclusively for peaceful aims. Now the Soviet Union has taken fresh steps in the same direction. They were described in detail by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his speech to the French parliamentarians. First, the Soviet leadership proposed to the U.S. Government that agreement be reached on completely banning for both sides strike space weapons and reducing by 50 percent their nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory.

[Volskiy] That proposal contains a practical solution of those same tasks which were agreed on by the Soviet Union and the United States this January as the aims of the Geneva talks. They consist, I will recall, of not only ending the arms race, but also sharply reducing the level of arms and at the same time preventing the arms race in space. The achievement of those aims would strengthen strategic stability and mutual trust. The Soviet delegation has already received instructions to submit concrete proposals on these questions and the authority to give an exhaustive explanation to the U.S. partners at the negotiating table.

[Andrianov] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev also made a statement about a second important step by our country taken with the aim of ending the ruinous process of the arms race. It concerns medium-range nuclear systems in Europe. In order to make it easier to achieve an accord on their mutual reduction as soon as possible, the Soviet Union considers it possible to conclude a corresponding agreement separately without linking it directly to the problem of space and strategic weapons. Such an approach by our country takes into account that West Europe has an interest in solving the question of such a reduction: In other words, the Soviet Union is going halfway to meet those who have an interest in it as it does itself.

[Nekrasov] And in this connection Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev elucidated our country's position on the question of the place of the nuclear potential of France and Britain in the European balance of forces. That potential is growing rapidly, so naturally the Soviet Union cannot in fact close its eyes to it. We think that the statement by the French side that France's nuclear forces cannot be discussed without its participation is a reasonable one. Therefore we must try to find an acceptable way out by joint efforts; the Soviet Union is expressing its readiness to hold direct talks on this subject with France and, equally, with Britain. At the same time, it was stressed that our side would take France's security interests into account in the most careful way.

[Andrianov] The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee also spoke of a third serious step by the Soviet Union in the European zone. On alert duty there are now 243 Soviet SS-20 medium-range missiles -- in other words, exactly the same number as there was last June when the additional stationing of our missiles was started in response to the siting of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. The SS-20 missiles that were additionally deployed have now been taken off alert duty and the stationary installations where they were sited will be dismantled in the next 2 months. Our counter-measures in relation to the territory of the United States itself, however, remain in force. In the European zone, the Soviet Union has completely removed the old SS-5 missiles from its armaments and is continuing to remove its SS-4 missiles. This means that in the European zone of our country the overall number of medium-range carrier rockets is now considerably less than 10 or even 15 years ago. Our country is adopting such a self-limitation guided by the broad interests of European security; now Europe has the right to expect a step in response by the United States -- an end to the further stationing of U.S. medium-range missiles on the European continent.

[Volskiy] The new proposals by the Soviet Union, combined with its previous acts, represent a whole complex of constructive and realistic measures.

Implementation of them would lead to a genuine turning point in the development of international relations -- a turning point, naturally, in favor of peace, security and cooperation among peoples. It may be said that is our program for improving the explosive international situation that is threatening peace. The realization of that program would also mean significant progress toward the banning and complete liquidation of nuclear weapons; saving mankind completely from the threat of nuclear war. Such an aim is deeply desired by, and important to, all peoples.

[Andrianov] And all in all, this is being emphasized in comments from abroad. That is because the visit of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to France and the new major peace initiatives of the Soviet Union put forward during the meeting of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee with French deputies, have given rise to numerous comments and large scale response abroad. The French paper MATIN, for example, which is close to the ruling socialist party, noting the great significance of the new Soviet proposals, has emphasized that the U.S. Administration ought to pay attention to them. According to a report published by another French newspaper, LES ECHOS, the proposal concerning a complete ban on space strike armaments for the USSR and United States, and the really radical reduction -- by 50 percent -- of the nuclear armaments capable of reaching each other's territory, which has been put forward will be attractive for West European political figures. The statement by the Soviet leader has become a major action, consonant with European public opinion, the British company BBC has noted, stressing that it is a very intelligent move in respect to West Europe. The new Soviet proposals -- the Japanese paper ASAHI has pointed out -- shows that the USSR is sincerely striving for progress at the Geneva talks, as well as at the upcoming Soviet-American summit in November. The Soviet leader's proposals, in this paper's opinion, will be assessed positively in West Europe.

Judging by reports from across the ocean, there are people there whom it does not suit. As the American company NBC has noted, President Reagan and his closest aides are quite uneasy about the influence of the Soviet Union's foreign policy initiatives on political and public circles. The Soviet leader has presented Soviet policy at the talks on the issues of control over armaments in a new light, NBC has stressed, acknowledging that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has indisputable skills in rendering Soviet foreign policy views. THE WASHINGTON POST has pointed out the new Soviet approach to the problem of controlling armaments, which was shown in Paris by the outstanding public diplomacy of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

23 October 1985

World Reaction

[Nekrasov] I think, Boris Vasilyevich, that if we sum up comments on these first days, immediately following the close of the visit, notwithstanding a certain dissonance, which is quite understandable taking into account various trends in the Western world, these comments are dominated by general recognition of the cardinal nature of the Soviet Union's approach to the global problems of the present times, which millions of people are concerned with in a truly profound and sweeping way. The Soviet Union has put forward -- as the world press writes in an almost unanimous way -- a far-reaching complex of constructive and realistic measures, realization of which is capable of leading to a genuine turnaround in international relations. As the honored Soviet guest stressed in Paris, "to find and verify a course for a peaceful future, to diminish the terrible danger which hangs over the peoples, is, we believe, the primary duty of states and political figures before the present and future generations." It is clear, that it is only possible to follow this path, so to speak, together. The West should cover its part of the path now. Will it cover it, or not?

As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev points out, it now appears that all responsible politicians agree with the fact that there could be no winners in a nuclear war.

At the same time, we are aware of that political force, which is at the disposal of militarist circles in the main Western countries, first of all, in the United States, of course; of that influence which has been gained, especially of late, by the military and industrial complex. That was why our warning sounded at a timely moment in Paris: We are strong enough -- Comrade Gorbachev said when addressing the deputies -- to give a crushing rebuff to any attempt to encroach upon the security and peaceful labor of our people.

[Andrianov] And in this connection, I believe, it is appropriate to recall the assessment of the situation made by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in his speech on French television. There is little comfort in what is going on in the world today, he said.

Necessity For Talks

[Nekrasov] The same speech you have mentioned also contained quite an important reminder to Western political figures: One should build peace proceeding from reality; one should take reality into account -- Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev added -- this is a serious thing. Those in the West who believe that one country can act in the international arena alone, or a group of countries, have an incorrect vision of the modern world. It is not a secret, as was repeatedly noted in the course of the visit, that today it is already very difficult to negotiate not only complex issues, but also relatively simple problems; tomorrow it can become even more difficult to talk. Moreover, as Comrade Gorbachev has pointed out, events can take place, which would get out of control, capable of completely denying opportunities to search for a peaceful settlement of problems. Why is that? Primarily because the arms race may be taken into space. And certainly, the assertion that this is going to be an ostensibly nonnuclear armament is not trustworthy at all. We know already, for instance, that the principle of the so-called nuclear trigger, that is, of another combat use for nuclear weapons, is laid as a basis for the laser weapons, on which rest the chief hopes of the Washington "star wars" planners. [as heard]

[Andrianov] Incidentally, Vadim Nikolayevich, I would like to recall the fact that it is precisely these last few days that saw the 28th anniversary of the beginning of the space era of humanity, when the first Soviet sputnik emerged over earth. All our intentions were then, and are now, directed at the peaceful development of astronautics

in the interests of the whole of mankind. But the United States, literally since the very early days, has been thinking of the military uses of space. First projects such as these, appeared -- we know it now from reports carried by the American press -- literally 1 or 2 years after the space era had begun.

Chemical Weapons

[Nekrasov] Yes, the danger is mounting not only in the nuclear and space fields. Let us take the American plans for production of the binary chemical weapons. Their capability for massive destruction of people and, by and large, of the civil population has been touched upon, as you know, at the recent press conference in Moscow. These weapons are capable of killing millions of people in a matter of hours. It was typical when U.S. General Rogers, the NATO commander in chief in Europe, admitted recently -- this admission was a part of the interview he has given to the French magazine SCIENCE ET VIE -- that Washington includes the new chemical weapons in the same category of combat resources as the tactical nuclear weapons. To establish some kind of measure of international control over the binary battle reserves, provided an appropriate international decision is taken, would rather be a difficult task.

European Participation

In short, what is involved is the growing danger of the existing agreements on limitation of the arms race, primarily of the nuclear one, losing their meaning; it would be extremely difficult to negotiate some kind of new measures. The wide circles of the peace-loving public and the antiwar movement are aware of all that; this is also understood by those Western political figures who think soberly. This is exactly why the Soviet Union's warning concerning the fact that what is involved today is not just the position of the Soviet Union and the United States, falls on fertile ground. The responsibility lies with other countries as well. Every responsible government or political figure should assume a clearest position in respect to this matter.

[Andrianov] In this connection, the ideas and proposals concerning Europe, provision for European security and development of the process of detente on the continent, which were expressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in the course of his visit to France, are assuming great international significance. On one hand, the assertion that peace in the entire world is especially dependent on the situation in Europe, is true. And on the other, it is clear that Europe more than any other continent is vulnerable to armed conflict, especially a nuclear conflict.

[Nekrasov] And in this connection, the Soviet side during the Paris meetings noted that at present security in Europe cannot be achieved by military means, by military force. This is a new contribution to the issue of the future of our continent, brought in by life itself. That is why a serious reinterpretation of European problems is necessary, as well as bringing views in the military and political spheres into full accordance with reality. Security in Europe, just as with international security on the whole, can only be achieved by following the path of the peaceful coexistence, detente, disarmament, confidence-building and development of cooperation. In this connection, one should note the great deal of attention, and, I would say, warm and well-disposed interest caused by the ideas expressed by Comrade Gorbachev as regards possibilities of consolidation and development of detente in various fields of overall European cooperation, not only in the political, but also in the economic and cultural fields, in protection of environment, etc.

23 October 1985

Soviet-French Discussions

[Volskiy] Not only global and European problems were discussed at the Soviet-French talks, but questions of a regional character too. This is in my opinion quite natural, as Moscow's and Paris' stands on many such questions concur very substantially. On some questions there is mutual understanding, on others there are differences. Of course, differences are inevitable considering the different class character of the policies of the two states and the fact that they belong to different political organizations. Here are noteworthy examples from the past. In Central America, for example, France has never declared its support for the United States' interventionist policy. Moreover, 3 years ago, together with Mexico, it recognized the Salvadoran patriots, who had stirred up rebellion against the pro-U.S. regime, as being a party to military conflict, which gave them the possibility of feeling more confident in the international arena.

Now let's take the Near East. I won't go into the details of French policy in this stormy region -- it is far from simple -- but I will give just one recent fact. President Mitterrand, as you know, refused to take part in the meeting of leaders of developed capitalist states, which Reagan is convening. French television gave the protest against Washington's support of the Israeli attack on the PLO establishment in Tunis as one of the reasons for this decision.

CSO: 5200/1052

GENERAL

MOSCOW WEEKLY TALK SHOW: NEW PROPOSALS, INF

LD052300 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 4 Oct 85

["International Situation--Questions and Answers" program, presented by Pavek Kasparov, All-Union Radio foreign-political commentator, with TASS observers Oleg Shirokov and Vladimir Matyash]

Gorbachev Proposals in France

[Excerpts] [Kasparov] As you know, comrades, discussions are going on at summit level between President Francois Mitterrand of France and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Many listeners ask us to tell them about the nature of Soviet-French relations, their history, and also their prospects. Those who wrote include (Vitaliy Semenovich Gorshkov) of Dushanbe, the (Danilov) family from Kiev, (Pavel Nikolayevich Verevkin) from Yefremov, in Tula Oblast, and many others. I have asked TASS observer Oleg Shirokov to fulfill your request. Oleg Alekseyevich was for many years the head of the TASS office in Paris and has reported on many Soviet-French summit meetings in that time. He has a thorough knowledge of the history of the relations of our two countries and also of the present state of cooperation between the Soviet Union and France. So over to you, Oleg Alekseyevich.

[Shirokov] In these fine October days, the world's eyes are riveted on the French capital; not just because the golden autumn makes this splendid city still more beautiful. Soviet-French summit dialogues are currently taking place in Paris at a very critical time for the world, when the arms race, which is being whipped up by Washington in the search for military superiority, is becoming more and more intense, when the U.S. plans for the militarization of space can only able to bring mankind closer to the abyss of a nuclear disaster. The elimination of this threat requires a responsible approach and the multiplication of effort in every way by all states.

The Soviet Union and France have a great deal of experience in cooperating in the interests of peace. The best proof of this is historical experience. When Russia and France, the Soviet Union and France, have cooperated, it has benefited them, as it has all Europe and all the world. Conversely, alienation and enmity have harmed our national interests and have had a negative effect on the international atmosphere, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in his interview for French television on the eve of his visit to France. The Soviet Union and France have a real opportunity to make a significant contribution to the cause of mutual understanding and cooperation of the peoples. With this hope, I am setting off for France, stressed the Soviet leader.

Indeed, from the point of view of the Soviet Union, good relations between the USSR and France are an important and constant factor in European and world politics. This is not only a matter of tradition, of the mutual fellow-feeling which the Soviet and French peoples have for each other. What is important is the objective interest of the Soviet Union and France, two major European powers, in the preservation of peace within our continent and beyond. This task becomes particularly urgent in conditions of an acute worsening of tension, brought about by the fault of militarist adventurist forces. As a result, the threat of a nuclear conflict has increased -- for France also. The French understand this well. The French public are greatly impressed by the fact that the Soviet Union is persistently seeking a method to break out of the vicious circle of the arms race, to exit from the dead end in the process of the limitation of this dangerous stockpiling.

In France, they know of our peace initiatives, including the unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions. At the same time it should be pointed out that two tendencies are forever clashing in France's policy in relation to our state: a realistic one, based on the interests of peace and security and one imbued with the class ideology of the bourgeoisie. Frequently, both tendencies are displayed at the same time, which leads to zigzags in French policy and uneven development of our relations. And, if the line for mutually beneficial cooperation prevails, this is in no small degree due to the objective coincidence of the vital national interests of our two countries and peoples in the struggle for the peace and security of Europe. For example, the joint struggle against fascism, for the liberation of Europe, brotherhood-in-arms, brought our peoples closer together and showed the vital force of our friendship. In subsequent years, Soviet-French cooperation stimulated detente and helped to put in practice the principles of peaceful coexistence, to strengthen security and equilibrium in Europe. In relations between the Soviet Union and France, many new principles and forms of political and economic cooperation were tested. Their significance went far beyond the framework of bilateral relations. For the first time in the practice of states with different social systems, the principle of regular summit meetings was adopted. A broad system of links in the most widely varied spheres was created. Accord was reached on the question of preventing random unsanctioned use of nuclear weapons. A direct line between the Kremlin and the Elysee Palace was established.

In present conditions, the field for Soviet-French cooperation is expanding. Its significance is increasing all the time. This applies primarily to problems of the struggle for the preservation of peace, the elimination of the hotbeds of war danger, halting the nuclear arms race, and the militarization of space. It also concerns cooperation at the conference in Stockholm, with the aim of working out and adopting measures to build confidence and strengthen security in Europe, to continue and to intensify the All-European process in the spirit of the Helsinki agreements. We have, of course, quite a few differences, for instance, over Euromissiles.

In recent years, France has activated its links with NATO and it continues to build up nuclear weapons. The United States and NATO are continually exerting pressure on Paris; not without some effect. However, the French, like other Europeans, oppose turning the European Continent into a field of nuclear conflict. Although official authorities supported the NATO decision on arming, broad political and public circles in the country condemn the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Western Europe since this undermines security and intensifies the nuclear threat. In France, as in other European countries, there is a growing mass movement against the nuclear arms race.

French statesmen, as is known, oppose carrying the arms race into space. Voices have often been heard from France in favor of making the situation in Europe and the world more healthy. Thus, for instance, addressing an American audience the other day, Thomas, the French minister for external relations, pointed out that, without the Soviet Union, certain problems could not be solved, particularly problems of security and disarmament.

At the same time it should be said that France and the Soviet Union do not always assess and approach problems in the same way, nor are the motives for their action in the international arena the same. This is understandable, since our countries belong to differing socioeconomic systems. They are members of different alliances; hence the differing analysis of this or that international problem and the differing approaches to resolving such problems. However, experience, including that of the recent past, shows that a very great deal depends upon the degree of interaction between Moscow and Paris in the international arena. This experience should be valued highly.

One of the major elements of peace and security in Europe is the inviolability of the borders which were established as a result of World War II. Mutual understanding on this vital issue has always existed between the Soviet Union and France. The principle of the inviolability of borders was consolidated by the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference. Historical experience shows that the revival of German militarism and revanchism creates a serious threat to peace and security in Europe; all the more so because in modern conditions, it is revanchists who are involved, who aspire to get nuclear weapons at their disposal and get the backing of the NATO military potential.

All these questions are now being considered in Paris at the talks between the leaders of our countries. Both sides manifest a wish to give a new impetus to the development of relations between the Soviet Union and France, and to bring their positions closer on topical international problems. This is exactly what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke of when he addressed French parliamentarians on 3 October in Paris. 'We consider it very important now, he said, to speedily halt the infernal train of the arms race before it is too late, to begin arms reductions, improve the international situation, and develop peaceful cooperation between our peoples. This is in our mutual interests. It is a universal task. Nobody can afford to sit on the sidelines. The Soviet Union, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed, as you no doubt already know, does not only call on others, it itself acts in this direction.

Commenting on the Soviet-French talks, L'HUMANITE says: The problem of disarmament and questions related to preventing a space arms race occupied a central place in the talks. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev pointed out the need to take urgent measures to halt a process which could get out of control. He underlined the responsibility of states which possess major arsenals of strategic armaments and he noted the role which can be played by other countries which have nuclear weapons, such as France, in reducing to a minimum level the current balance of forces.

Yes, during the Soviet-French talks the most topical, the most burning questions of the present day are indeed being discussed. It is for precisely this reason that the whole world is now watching Paris so closely; where a political dialogue of great importance both for further cooperation and accord between the Soviet Union and France and for the improvement, which the world needs so much, in the international political climate, in the interests of detente and peace, is taking place.

Netherlands Protests on INF

[Karpov] (Martinyshin), of Pulkovo, and (Shcherba), of the village of (Sedanka), Tigilakiy Rayon, Kamchatka Oblast, ask us to talk about the antimissile movement in the Netherlands. Comrade (Martinyshin), in particular, writes: In our press I have recently read that plans to deploy U.S. cruise missiles in the Netherlands are evoking a resolute protest from the population. Could you talk about this in a little more detail?

The Netherlands is effectively the last remaining NATO country not to have implemented the North Atlantic bloc's 1979 decision on deployment of U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles on its territory. You remember that in the autumn of 1983, U.S. Pershing II missiles were first deployed in the FRG. Then Tomahawk cruise missiles with nuclear warheads were deployed in Britain and Italy. Relatively recently, U.S. Tomahawks appeared in Belgium. And now, to speak, it is the Netherlands' turn. According to the NATO generals' plans, 48 U.S. cruise missiles are to be deployed there.

However, this deployment must be preceded, it is announced in Amsterdam, by a special decision of the government, to be adopted, or otherwise, on 1 November this year. In the conditions which have arisen, transatlantic pressure -- which, according to the local press, has achieved an unprecedented scale -- continues to weigh increasingly on the government and parliament of the Netherlands. Further evidence of this pressure, in the view of observers, is, in particular, the recent statement by Van den Broek, the country's foreign minister, in New York: He said that in all probability the cabinet would permit deployment of the cruise missiles. Our participation in their deployment, the minister pointed out, now seems to have become inevitable.

But millions of Netherlandsers disagree with the view of the head of the Netherlands foreign policy department. Furthermore, this view has evoked sharp criticism even among the members of the ruling coalition and especially among members of the country's opposition political parties.

In this situation, observers term the position of Lubbers, the prime minister as difficult, as he cannot fail to take into account the view of the majority of the people who oppose the U.S. missiles; yet, at the same time, he is afraid to throw down a direct challenge to the United States. All this is taking place on the eve of parliamentary elections set for May 1986, on whose outcome the decision on deployment or nondeployment of U.S. Tomahawks will of course exert the most direct influence. Particularly, since the opposition parties categorically demand that cruise missiles not be introduced into the Netherlands.

The largest of these parties is the Labor Party, whose leader, Den Uyl, has firmly stated that, if his party wins the election and participates in government, it will seek a rejection of the missiles. Renunciation of the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles in the Netherlands is also demanded by the Netherlands Communist Party, the Pacifist Socialist Party, and the Radicals. They are supported in this struggle by the Federation of Netherlands Trade Unions and a number of women's and other mass public organizations.

All the antiwar movement organizations in the country have now united in a national committee entitled "No to Cruise Missiles." It is on this body's initiative that a form of referendum is being held in the Netherlands, in which every family will receive a postcard with the following text: To the government and the States General. I oppose nuclear weapons. On 1 November you will decide on the deployment of missiles on our territory. I beg you to say no to deployment. Space is left on the card for signatures. On 26 October this year, these signed postcards will be handed to members of the government and parliament.

At the same time, other mass actions by the antiwar movement in the country are being carried out. For example, a law suit against the state has been presented for the consideration of the Supreme Court of the Netherlands. Named as plaintiffs are 20,000 citizens and 250 public organizations of the country. The charge stresses that the deployment of U.S. missiles in the Netherlands would be an act in violation of a number of both national and international laws, as well as an assault on the sovereignty of the Netherlands.

Nonetheless, in the view of observers, the probability that the supporters of missile deployment will succeed in achieving the corresponding government decision and pushing it through parliament, cannot be entirely ruled out. If so, the opposition states, the struggle against the appearance of the missiles will flare up with even greater force; for every day more and more Netherlands become finally convinced of the justice of the conclusion that the new weapons, both in the Netherlands and in Europe as a whole, will not strengthen, but only undermine their security. History has shown many times before that the problem of strengthening peace is not resolved by an arms race, but by negotiations and disarmament.

CSO: 5200/1052

GENERAL

GORBACHEV GREETES ITALIAN PEACE MARCHERS

PM070918 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 85 First Edition p 1

["Text" of Mikhail Gorbachev's greetings to participants in the peace march "Perugia-Assisi"--"To the Participants of the 'Perugia-Assisi' Peace March"--PRAVDA headline]

[Text] "I heartily greet the participants in the peace march Perugia-Assisi. Your desire to achieve progress in the cause of securing peace and to stop the dangerous development of events in the international arena is close to the Soviet people.

The sword of Damocles of a nuclear catastrophe and of star wars is today raised over mankind. However, we believe that by the common, joint efforts of all peoples, of all peace-loving forces, it is still possible to carry this threat and set about a real reduction in armaments.

These aims are served by the concrete comprehensive program proposed by the Soviet Union of constructive measures directed at a cardinal improvement in the international situation and at stopping the arms race.

The Soviet Union the other day proposed to the U.S. government that an agreement should be reached on both sides totally banning space strike weapons and reducing really radically, by 50 percent, the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory. We have demonstrated our goodwill in a convincing and visible manner. Now it is the turn of our negotiating partners.

"As concerns your very topical slogan on freezing military expenditure, I recall that as far back as 1984 the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states proposed to NATO countries that negotiations should be commenced on mutual nonincrease of military spending and on subsequent reduction of that spending.

"The antiwar movement can speak its weight in deciding the fate of mankind: Whether there is peace or a war of extermination. Differences of political and ideological nature take a back seat when it is a matter of life on earth.

"Your march, and other actions by the champions of peace are an important contribution to the noble struggle against the flight of the arms race into the heights of space, and for the peaceful life of peoples.

I wish you, and the whole anti-war movement of Italy great success. M. Gorbachev

GENERAL

TASS CITES PRAVDA ON UN SESSION, NOTES ARMS RACE ON AGENDA

LD280957 Moscow TASS in English 0850 GMT 28 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, 28 Sep (TASS)--The general political discussion which is continuing at the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly shows that the international community "strives to find efficient ways of improving the international situation, that it strives for peace, cooperation, but not confrontation or the arms race," write in PRAVDA its special correspondents Tomas Kolesnichenko and Andrey Tolkunov. The overwhelming majority of the speakers call for preventing the arms race in outer space and terminating it on earth: eliminating the nuclear threat, they forward concrete proposals in this direction." Thus, the Foreign Minister of Luxembourg Jacques Poes, speaking on behalf of the Common Market countries, stated that they welcomed the efforts aimed at preventing the arms race in outer space. The statement was made, though the United States, conducting the "arms twisting policy," is forcing its allies to join its "star venture."

"The speakers also declare in support of such topical proposals as the moratorium on any nuclear explosions which was unilaterally announced by the USSR, the freezing of nuclear arsenals, etc., the correspondents point out. The nuclear weapon stocks are on the rise, said foreign minister of Sweden, Lennart Bodstrom. Therefore the proposal on freezing nuclear weapons remains so timely.

Representatives of Finland, Greece, New Zealand put forward once again the initiatives that nuclear-free zones be formed in their regions, which, they said, would help ease the international situation, establish durable peace. The Soviet Union is known to be coming out in support of these proposals.

The delegates of India, Austria, Belgium, Spain, Indonesia, Kuwait, Ecuador, noted the important role of the United Nations in solution of global political and economic problems, they strongly criticised the criminal apartheid regime in the Republic of South Africa and declared for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and in the Central American region, the PRAVDA correspondents write.

CSO: 5200/1050

GENERAL

SOVIETS REAFFIRM SUPPORT FOR UN NONUSE OF FORCE TREATY

LD080833 Moscow TASS in English 0809 GMT 8 Oct 85

[Text] New York, October 8 TASS -- TASS correspondent Sergey Baybakov reports:

The Soviet delegation has again reaffirmed at the 40th U.N. General Assembly session its readiness to make every effort for speedily drawing up a world treaty on non-use of force in international relations.

At the session of the Sixth Committee (legal issues) of the assembly, which is discussing the report on enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force in international relations the Soviet Union proposed that work be started on drawing up a declaration to reaffirm and develop the principle of non-use of force under the conditions of the space nuclear era, and point in particular to the need for an unconditional ban on the use of any, whether it be nuclear or conventional, weapons. This initiative has been supported by the delegations of Brazil, Burundi, Lesotho, Syria and other countries.

The adoption of a declaration may become a considerable contribution to strengthening the fundamentals of peace and improving the international situation, said Soviet delegate V.F. Petrovskiy. We are convinced that if an effort is made to enhance not just by word of mouth, but in action the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force, that weighty and useful document could be drawn up without any delay, the more so that representatives of all groups of states, above all of the Non-aligned Movement earlier declared for the adoption of a declaration in some or other form. Thus an important step would be made towards a world treaty on non-use of force in international relations.

Albeit the idea of signing such a treaty was put forward way back in 1976, it has not been implemented until now because of the obstruction of the NATO member-countries. At the current session of the Sixth Committee the U.S. delegation has outright, without even taking the trouble of analyzing the fresh Soviet proposal, rejected it. Thus the USA has again demonstrated that behind its assurances of preparedness to resolve difficult problems of the present-day international relations is only the intention to mislead world public opinion. Yet, as a matter of fact, the USA takes advantage of any opportunity to frustrate the Soviet Union's peaceful offensive.

As the Soviet delegate pointed out, the aggressive imperialist forces do not wish to reckon with the legitimate interests of other states and the political realities of the world today. In the drive for the chimera of military superiority they have brought the world to the threshold of a new spiral in arms race of unprecedented scale, which threatens to reach a qualitatively new stage with uncontrolled consequences. The unconstructive stand of the USA, including in the discussion of such important issues as non-use of force in inter-state relations at the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly, is a challenge to all U.N. member-states, since most of them have declared for continuing work to enhance the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force and adopt an appropriate document, the Soviet representative stressed.

CSO: 5200/1042

GENERAL

USSR'S LOMEYKO ON CSCE, ARMS ISSUES

AU011413 Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN in Russian No 9, Sep 85 (signed to press 21 Aug 85) pp 3-8

[Article by V. Lomeyko: "Peace, Security, and Cooperation for Europe"]

[Text] Those who happened to spend three significant days under the arches of the white marble Finlandia Palace, during which time a meeting took place between the representatives of 33 European countries, the United States, and Canada dedicated to the 10th anniversary of CSCE, could sense that the spirit and goals of Helsinki live on and are developing further, despite the considerable difficulties that exist. This is worth saying at the very beginning, because this is precisely the main conclusion reached by international observers who give unbiased appraisals despite the diversity of their political positions. This conclusion must also be stated because, on the threshold of the anniversary meeting, there were a considerable number of pessimistic prophecies by those forces which have long forgotten how to articulate the word "detente" and would like to introduce the word "confrontation" to the European political vocabulary instead of it.

There can be no argument that the ministers from 35 states who met at the anniversary meeting which opened in Helsinki on 30 July did so in a complex international situation and went to this meeting with dissimilar outlooks. This is understandable. The states participating in the all-European conference belong to different sociopolitical systems and to military alliances in opposition to one another, or number among the neutral and nonaligned countries. Hence the broad spectrum of political views and positions represented at the meeting in the Finlandia Palace. And the speeches themselves made by the leaders of the delegations from many countries differed greatly from one another. What, in this case, makes it possible to say that the meeting in Helsinki was useful and important and clearly demonstrated the vitality of the principles of the all-European conference?

We will cite the following arguments in confirmation of the above:

First, the very fact of participation in this meeting by the representatives of all 35 states participant in the all-European conference at the level of ministers of foreign affairs showed that the desire for constructive dialogue and for a continuation of the efforts aimed at strengthening security and cooperation on the European continent has, as a whole, gained the upper hand, despite opposition from certain circles in the West and the complexity of the present international situation, which only underlines the importance and significance of the anniversary meeting;

Second, the predominant tone of the speeches attested to the fact that the overwhelming majority of the participants in the meeting were in favor of the principles of the policy of peaceful coexistence and cooperation inherent in the Final Act, and that none of them questioned the value of the Helsinki agreements;

Third, attempts by certain representatives of the NATO countries to take out of context of the Final Act some of its clauses and to force a spirit of confrontation on the discussion by bringing far-fetched accusations against the socialist countries, in the sphere of human rights in particular, were not supported by the majority of delegates.

Those who went to the capital of Finland for the purpose of reading morals to others and lecturing other countries on how they should live clearly miscalculated in their hopes of meeting with a benevolent attitude to this destructive course. Europe wishes to live according to its own established laws. And the code of these laws once again appeared visibly before the participants in the meeting in the form of the voluminous book distributed to them -- "The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe" -- published in the six official languages of this forum.

Opening the meeting, M. Koivisto, President of the Finnish Republic, noted that the high level of the meeting and the presence at it of ministers responsible for foreign relations attested to serious adherence to the Final Act and to the agreements reached after the act had been signed. Having characterized the Final Act and other documents of the all-European conference as a vital program of action for the present day and a process begun by the all-European conference cannot progress by inertia. Progress primarily depends on the political will of the corresponding governments. There is no easy way to achieving the goals set in the Final Act.

The 10 years which have passed since the signing of the Helsinki agreements fully confirm these words. As L.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, noted in his speech at the meeting, the preparation and successful holding of the all-European conference had taken many years of persistent efforts by the participant states. Political will and diplomatic skill were required to develop and consolidate the principles of peaceful coexistence, cooperation, and trust in interstate relations.

Recalling that the Helsinki agreements were possible only on the basis of observing the Yalta and Potsdam decisions, Sgm Olszowski, minister of foreign affairs of the Polish People's Republic, stated that peace, security, and cooperation on the continent must be based on unquestionable recognition and observance of existing political and territorial realities. And B. Choupek, CCSR minister of foreign affairs, stressed that the cornerstones of the policy of detente and of the further development of peaceful cooperation in Europe were laid 10 years ago in Helsinki.

There is no doubt that the Helsinki agreements have stood the test of time. Wherein lies their vital strength? In the fact that they represent a collection of constructive mutual obligations. This was discussed by many speakers, in particular L. Gratz, Austrian minister of foreign affairs, K. Papoulas, Greek minister of foreign affairs, J. Clark, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, and others.

But the Final Act is not an impassive list of propositions. Its entire spirit and all of its principles orient the signatory states toward living in peace, fruitfully cooperating, and not imposing their views and systems on others. This simple fact is frequently forgotten or ignored by those who are inclined to interpret in their own way the strictly considered, mutually acceptable principles and theses of the Final Act by taking individual clauses out of context and attempting to set them in opposition to the document as a whole.

The vital strength of the Helsinki agreements lies in the fact that they are a system of balanced, generally acceptable agreements between states which, on the one hand, belong to opposite social systems and, on the other, have been led to peaceful cooperation by the entire objective course of political, economic, and cultural development within the framework of the European continent.

And to the question as to why it was precisely in Europe that detente was born and the spirit of Helsinki arose and materialized, there is an answer which has a long history and is backed up by the experience of the last decade: Europe, possibly more than any other continent, has gained peace through much suffering and, more than others, is predisposed to peaceful cooperation. The speeches made at the meeting by the head of the Soviet delegation and his talks with colleagues from other countries were imbued with these ideas. It should be stressed that this approach adopted by the Soviet Union met with the support of the majority of participants.

Ten years ago 33 European states, the United States, and Canada collectively spoke in favor of peaceful coexistence and cooperation on the basis of mutually acceptable principles. Born in the atmosphere of the all-European process of detente, the spirit of Helsinki has become a synonym for fruitful political dialogue. During the past 10 years the Soviet Union's attitude toward the Helsinki agreements has not changed. What is more, in our tense times we believe it important as never before to consolidate and develop everything positive that has been achieved in the sphere of peaceful cooperation between European peoples and to counteract the policy of confrontation and the arms race.

Europe is our common home and not a theater of military operations. These words, spoken by M.S. Gorbachev, reflect our attitude toward the continent where we live and toward our neighbors, and also our approach to the future. We indeed live in our common home -- Europe. And we are all vitally interested in maintaining normal, respectful, and, even better -- friendly relations with one another.

As the last decade has shown -- and this idea came across in the speeches of many participants in the meeting -- no international storms have been able to smash the tree of European detente. It has remained standing, it has proved to have strong roots. The positive force of the example of the all-European process of security and cooperation is making itself increasingly felt throughout the entire world today. In vain do supporters of the policy "from a position of strength," which regards Europe as a theater of conventional or "limited" nuclear war, take up arms against this process. They would like to destroy the spirit of Helsinki, just as they would like to destroy the spirit of Yalta and Potsdam. Not only historical events are connected with these events, but also the tested policy and practice of cooperation between states with different socioeconomic systems.

Peace and security in Europe have world significance not only because the security of the European continent is closely connected with security throughout the world. Europe "ripened" for detente earlier than other regions, and here there exists an objective necessity and an objective possibility for ensuring the countries of the continent greater security and greater cooperation. Nowhere in the world is there such direct, such solid confrontation of two military-political groups as in Europe. And nowhere, as in Europe, has such extensive, diverse experience been accumulated in reaching mutually acceptable agreements on complex disputes.

The development of European civilization and the economic and spiritual flowering of Europe are not only the result of efforts by each individual nation, but also the fruit of their mutual influence and interaction. European progress is a road paved by master craftsmen of the entire continent. And for every true European, the Cologne Cathedral or the Sofia Cathedral in Kiev, the Louvre or the Hermitage are achievements of our common European culture. And only a malicious barbarian could threaten the immortal chef d'oeuvres of genius and the skills of our ancestors with a bomb.

The speeches of the representatives of many countries, not only socialist, but also neutral countries and a number of others, were imbued with realization of this common responsibility for the destiny of European and world civilization and of present and future generations of mankind. The problems of military detente, the cessation of the arms race on earth, and the prevention of an arms race in outer space were at the center of the discussion. Many speakers, including R. Dumas, French minister of external relations, spoke in favor of achieving success as soon as possible at the negotiations in Geneva, Stockholm, and Vienna. Success can and must be achieved, they said, if all participants in the negotiations show the political will necessary for this.

The new Soviet initiative -- the Soviet Union's unilateral introduction of a moratorium on any nuclear explosions -- aroused a great response among the participants in the meeting. Many delegates stressed in their speeches that the adoption of similar obligations by the United States and other nuclear powers would pave the way to a total halting of nuclear explosions.

Journalists from various countries literally attacked U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz with their questions in an attempt to find out his reaction to the new peaceful Soviet proposal. How disappointed they were when he rejected the idea of a moratorium out of hand. And the attempt by American representatives to promote as a counter-proposal an invitation for Soviet specialists to attend nuclear tests in the state of Nevada gave rise to skeptical smiles in the majority of observers. Even among the United States' closest allies, one could hear puzzled questions: How can one compare these two incompatible approaches? Moscow proposes halting nuclear explosions, while Washington invites observers to attend their continuation. Instead of banning an evil, it counts on consecrating it and, what is more, in the presence of those against whom it is directed.

In the opinion of diplomats from various countries, including NATO countries, Washington's reluctance to respond to the Soviet proposal and halt the further modernization of nuclear weapons by means of carrying out underground explosions has once again exposed the meretricious peaceableness of the American administration.

Attempts by U.S. representatives to resort to favorite references to the impossibility of controlling moratoriums have had no success. Immediately after the Soviet Union adopted the decision to unilaterally halt any nuclear explosions beginning 6 August, many specialists in the West said that it is entirely possible to control the halting of nuclear explosions. Thus, the prominent Finnish foreign policy expert and deputy director of the Institute for Research into the Problems of Peace and Conflicts in Tampere, P. Yoenniemi, noted that in the problems of control over nuclear testing the Soviet Union conducts a flexible policy. In his opinion, modern technology makes it possible to observe nuclear explosions without being present at testing sites.

As M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed in his replies to questions by a TASS correspondent, our scientific-technological potential and those of the United States and other countries provide the necessary degree of confidence that a nuclear explosion, even of small yield, will be detected and will become known. Those who say the reverse is true know that this is not so.

One can say without exaggeration that the majority of speeches at the anniversary meeting in Helsinki were imbued with concern at the state of affairs in the sphere of security and contained an appeal for the adoption of urgent measures against a further increase in the danger of war. That is why those in the Finlandia Palace unanimously welcomed the agreement on the forthcoming top-level meeting to be held in November this year between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan.

The problems of preparing for this meeting were at the center of attention of the talk which took place on 31 July in Helsinki between the USSR minister of foreign affairs and the U.S. secretary of state. In commentaries on this subject international correspondents have noted that the Soviet Union regards preparation for the top-level meeting as being within the scheme of creating practical prerequisites for bringing about a change for the better in Soviet-American relations, improving the international situation, and seeking effective solutions to problems connected with the task of freeing mankind from the threat of war.

In this connection many people in Helsinki were interested in the course of the Geneva negotiations. Unfortunately, the second round has also confirmed that they are marking time. The reason is simple: the American side's unwillingness to act in accordance with the accord achieved in January. The essence of the accord is to halt the arms race on earth and to prevent it in our space. Instead of this the United States is continuing to implement a gigantic program of creating ever newer weapons of mass destruction. And it is paralyzing any possibilities of reducing nuclear weapons on earth by forcing through its program for "star wars" and for the creation of nuclear space weapons.

These plans bear a threat for all peoples, as extending the arms race into space will merely whip up the arms race in both nuclear and conventional weapons. History, however, has proven that more weapons do not at all mean greater security. In fact, the very reverse is the case: an increase in weapons destabilizes peace.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it will not permit superiority over itself and will find effective means of counteraction if it is faced with a threat from outer space. But we are against the creation of new types of weapons of mass destruction primarily because this is amoral, wasteful, and senseless. It was on this subject that discussion was held at the meetings in Helsinki with diplomats and journalists from various countries, who showed great interest in the Soviet delegation.

Among the positive factors of the jubilee meeting in the capital of Finland there should also be noted the circumstance that it provided an opportunity not only to exchange opinions on the results of the last decade, but also to discuss many critical international problems as well as questions of bilateral relations which are of mutual interest. According to the estimate of P. Vayrynen, minister of foreign affairs of Finland, in the course of this meeting the ministers of foreign affairs conducted over 200 bilateral and multilateral talks. This undoubtedly increased the general potential for mutual understanding and cooperation.

More than 1,200 representatives of the international press, among whom Finnish journalists naturally composed the largest group (several hundred people), covered the work of the jubilee meeting. The large numbers and the representatives of the corps of journalists which came to Helsinki also attested to the lively interest of the broad international public -- and not only that of the countries participating in the conference -- in the development of the all.

European process.

The Finnish hosts did a great deal to make the meeting pass in a constructive spirit of good will. All the halls of the Finlandia palace were equipped in the best manner for productive work. The laconic and efficient hosts fully deserved the gratitude and recognition of all foreign participants. And not only for the irreproachable organization of the meeting, but primarily for the atmosphere of cordiality, hospitality, and sincere interest in its success.

And what is involved here is not only the Finns' natural aspiration to do everything to make the participants in the meeting feel not like guests, but rather at home. The European public, including the Finns, was undoubtedly interested in marking the 10th anniversary of the Final Act in a constructive atmosphere of good will.

The course of the work of the jubilee meeting in Helsinki thus showed that the majority of Europeans recognize that confrontation is contrary to their common interests and that in Europe the pull toward widening peaceful cooperation is noticeably increasing.

The Europeans could undoubtedly set an example of a sensible and responsible approach, in order to direct the intellect, energy, and wealth of mankind not toward fruitless confrontation, but toward mutually advantageous cooperation. They could show a political will for dialogue and be able to rise above disagreements in order to see the horizons of a new Europe. If the resources which are today being expended on the dangerous and destructive arms race were to be directed toward all-European cooperation projects, our common home could be made more secure, and life in it could be made more reliable and better. New wide-scale, long-term projects of scientific and economic cooperation would open up hundreds of thousands of new workplaces, expand international trade, and combine the efforts of East and West in the struggle against the diseases of the age and for the protection of the environment.

The achievements of the century open up new possibilities for international cooperation both on Earth and at the bottom of the seas and oceans and in outer space. And if efforts were combined, all-European peaceful research in outer space could contribute to the swiftest solution of many economic and scientific problems, and also to more effective utilization of the natural resources of our continent.

The Soviet Union intends to continue along the road outlined at Helsinki, the road of widening and deepening in every possible way our cooperation with all states, large and small, that are ready to reciprocate with us. And it is with particular respect that we value the role of the country which hosted the meeting, a country which is making such a weighty contribution to the development of the all-European process. With its balanced, realistic policy, Finland has won growing respect from its neighbors. For us the Soviet-Finnish relations of friendship, good-neighborliness, and trust largely represent a prototype for the desired future relations between all neighbors in Europe, our common home.

The Helsinki meeting was an important event of not only European but also international significance, and confirmed the vitality of the Final Act's principles, as a CPSU Central Committee Politburo session noted. It contributed to the development of positive trends in the relations between European states. In order to give them steady and progressive motion, it is now particularly necessary to augment the efforts of all participant states on both a multilateral and bilateral basis in the interests of peace and the security of peoples.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye". "Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn", 1985.

CSO: 5200/1042

GENERAL

IZVESTIYA: SOVIET, FRG CITIZENS DISCUSS EUROPEAN SECURITY

PM031552 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Oct 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Ye. Grishin dispatch: "For the Sake of Detente"]

[Text] Locom--A meeting of representatives of the public from the USSR and the FRG has been held in the lower Saxony town of Locom devoted to the development of Soviet-West German relations and the problems of European and international security. Politicians, social and religious figures, and parliamentarians took part in this representative dialogue.

The report by A. B. Chakovskiy, head of the Soviet delegation and USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, pointed to the seriousness of the situation prevailing in the world as a result of the aggressive foreign policy course of the U.S. administration. There are no people in the world who would not be alarmed at the arms race and the U.S. plans for the militarization of space. The implementation of these plans would undermine the disarmament talks and sharply increase the danger of a global annihilatory conflict. The Soviet public is extremely concerned at the approving attitude of FRG ruling circles to the program for the creation of space strike weapons.

The USSR and the FRG, despite their adherence to different socioeconomic systems and military-political alliances, are fully capable of being partners in resolving the cardinal problems of the day. This was convincingly the seventies, the speaker continued. The Moscow treaty signed 12 August 1970, was an important factor in European security and opened up the way for productive cooperation in all spheres. The last 15 years have reaffirmed the historic importance of that document.

The West German side's report was delivered by H. Stercken (Christian Democratic Union), chairman of the Bundestag Foreign Affairs Commission. Stating his country's desire to develop cooperation with the Soviet Union and Bonn's intention to pursue a policy of peace and strengthening security, the speaker at the same time set forth the well known positions of the FRG Government, which supports the Reagan administration's course. H. Stercken tried to downplay the real danger of the militarization of space.

The overwhelming majority of the meeting participants rejected the so-called "strategic defense initiative" and condemned Bonn's readiness to participate in it. The dangerous aspirations of the FRG leadership are provoking mounting criticism even in the ranks of the ruling conservative parties. The meeting was addressed in particular by D. (Gol) (Christian Democratic Union), a representative of the "Christian Democrats for Disarmament" organization. On behalf of the members of his organization he read out a statement demanding that the government reject participation in the U.S. program for the militarization of space and make a constructive contribution to the cause of disarmament.

CSO: 5200/1042

GENERAL

PRAVDA CRITICIZES PRC FOREIGN MINISTER ON ARMS SPEECH

PM021035 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "United Nations: General Political Discussion Continues"]

[Excerpts] New York, 1 Oct -- Man's desire to eliminate the nuclear threat, halt the arms race on earth, and prevent it in space is reflected by the general political discussion continuing at the 40th UN General Assembly session.

PRC Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian spoke of his country's readiness, together with all UN states, to act to strengthen that organization's role. In particular he advocated that all nuclear powers undertake to renounce first use of nuclear weapons in any circumstances and conclude as rapidly as possible an international agreement on the total prohibition and destruction of space weapons inasmuch as "space belongs to all mankind and must be used exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all." He also advocated the conclusion of a convention on the total prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. Here Wu Xueqian proceeded from the well-known stance taken by Beijing, which is seeking to present matters as though "the main threat" to peace issues from the arms race between the United States and the USSR and ignored the fundamental difference in the approaches of the Soviet Union and the United States to this fundamental issue of the present day. As for the nuclear preparations of China, which is also a nuclear power, he tried to present them in the most favorable light.

CSO: 5200/1042

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

01 NOV 85